

SYRIAN SENSE

No. CCCXXXIX (339)

January 11, 2014

A young Syrian woman lists eight reasons why the New World Order hates her country and its present government – resisting the Antichrist.

A remarkable summary on the political level of how and why the world has gone so wrong today is presented on YouTube by “Syrian Girl Partisan.” She is a young Syrian patriot giving eight reasons why the New World Order hates Syria and is doing all it can to overthrow the present Syrian government and replace it with NWO puppets. But Catholics must not allow Western propaganda and lies to poison their minds, nor must they say that politics have nothing to do with religion. The NWO is driven by the mad dream of eliminating altogether the Social Kingship of Christ the King, together with God’s natural world order. Here are the Syrian Girl’s reasons:—

1 Syria’s Central Bank is state-owned and state-controlled so as to serve the national economy and the Syrian people, instead of enriching the international banksters of the Western nations and Israel, who force upon almost all nations of the world usurious loans generating artificial debt crises by which these nations are in effect enslaved. 2 Syria has no international Monetary Fund debt. The IMF acts as the debt collection police of the international banksters. Any wise nation stays out of the IMF’s clutches, which is what Syria has succeeded in doing, but the banksters are not happy at all with such wisdom. 3 Syria has banned genetically modified seeds, or “Franken-food,” because Bashar Assad wants to protect his people’s health. “Franken-food” means food control which means population control. Obviously the NWO favours “Franken-food” (the USA imposed it on conquered Iraq.) 4 Syria’s population is well-informed about the NWO, whose domination of the world’s puppet politicians by its think-tanks and secret societies is openly discussed in Syria’s media and universities. Such openness is anathema to the NWO, which must cover its operations in darkness. 5 Syria has massive oil and gas reserves, and it is working to exploit them independently of the giant Western oil companies like Shell and Texaco. The NWO loves oil, but not oil independence. 6 Syria clearly and unequivocally opposes Zionism and Israel. In recent years even the base Western media have reacted to Israel’s virtual turning of Palestine into a mega-Goulag. Syria denounces Israel’s brutal apartheid. Obviously the Jewish lobbies all round the world will unite to use all their influence to

put an end to such firm opposition to their fellow-Jews in Israel. 7 Syria is one of the last secular Muslim States in the Middle East, and refuses to recognize any superiority of that people which still claims to be the Chosen People of God (even 2,000 years after the Incarnate God, Jesus Christ, ceased to choose his People by race and began to choose it instead by faith – Romans III, IV, etc.). The same lobbies will chastise any refusal of their religious as of their racial superiority. 8 Syria proudly maintains and protects its political and cultural national identity, whereas the NWO seeks to melt down all nations (except one) into a single conglomerate mass of sheeple for the approaching Antichrist.

Watch the original nine-minute video of “Syrian Girl Partisan” on YouTube, or read the excellent Argentinian commentator’s summary on actualidad.rt.com/expertos/salbuchi. (These “Eleison Comments” draw heavily on Adrian Salbuchi’s text.) Whatever be other faults of the Muslim nations, who cannot notice how much more they are doing than the corrupt and decadent Western nations to resist the godless New World Order?

Kyrie eleison.

BILLOT – III

No. CCCXXXVIII (338)

January 4, 2014

In particular the Cardinal's reflections on the need to see how the Revolution attacks religion should be heeded by the SSPX's leaders.

The present leaders of the Society of St Pius X are working steadily and craftily towards inserting it into the framework of the mainstream Church, which is steadily and craftily pushing forward the Revolutionary and Conciliar ideals of liberty (religious liberty), equality (collegiality) and fraternity (ecumenism). Yet these leaders surely take Cardinal Billot seriously. They should meditate on his reflections on our Fifth Age of the Church which follow his exposition of the Seven Ages in the Epilogue to the first volume of his celebrated *Treatise on the Church of Christ*. Here are some of those reflections, freely translated and adapted from the Latin:—

“Our own age would then be the Fifth Age, Age of defection, apostasy and liberalism, coming between the end of the Holy Roman Empire and what St Paul calls a “resurrection from the dead” (Rom. XI, 15). May it be so! It gives us all amidst our so many and so great tribulations of today (the Cardinal wrote in 1927 – what would he have written in 2013?) hope of a future restoration and – forgive the expression – Counter-revolution. Already today many leading scientists, politicians and economists are recognizing and freely admitting how poisoned are the fruits of the French Revolution of 1789, which proclaimed that the one and only source of all the world's ills was scorn for the “rights of man.” What frivolity! What silliness! What stupidity!

“The Revolutionaries' liberty results in tyranny of the strong over the weak; their equality results in a few millionaires lording it ever more over the people (one thinks of Wall Street, 2013!); their fraternity results in internal strife and class hatred. Some people grasp this, while many do not see the essentially satanic character of the Revolution. However those who go beneath the surface see that the religious question underlies all other questions presently agitating mankind: that the plague of political and economic liberalism arises from the atheistic and anti-Christian liberalism laid out above; that the social order can in no way be restored unless the Church's principles once more direct public life.

“Would that this recognition of the theory might bear practical fruit! With all our heart we call for such a restoration, knowing how the pagan laws under which we are now living may still allow individuals to be Christian(in 2013, how much longer?), but they make a Christian society altogether impossible. Therefore we seek above all the kingdom of God and his justice, without despising the rest that will be added unto us (cf. Mt. VI, 33). As St Paul says of godliness that it is, “profitable to all things,” so too is the Church’s influence, “having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come”(cf. I Tim. IV, 8).” It is not difficult to see here how the Cardinal was not one of the many souls he mentions that do not see through the false glamour of the modern world. On the contrary his firm grasp of Catholic doctrine enables him to describe our own times, nearly a century later.

SSPX Headquarters, wake up from your foolish dream of converting the liberals now controlling the Church, and stop pretending with a flow of ambiguous Declarations that you are still defending Tradition. Your actions prove the contrary, and actions speak louder than a series of Declarations! *You have the name of being alive, but you are dead. Wake up, and strengthen the things that remain, which are ready to die. Have in mind what you received from the Archbishop, and put it into practice, and do penance. Kyrie eleison.*

GOOD NEWS

No. CCCXL (340)

January 18, 2014

Benefactors came through for the purchase of a House for the Resistance in England, and SSPX priests in France are stirring.

The first piece of good news is that Queen of Martyrs house in south-east England is being bought these very days. At first the purchase price seemed out of reach, but two telephone calls to a French and an American benefactor promptly raised about two fifths and another quarter respectively of the sum needed, and suddenly the purchase came within range. About another seventh part came from the many benefactors of the St Marcel Initiative, I emptied out several piggy-banks of my own, and finally an Asian benefactor put us over the top.

Resounding thanks to every one of you that contributed, because the smaller donations are not to be scorned. God does not look only on the amount. Maybe only when he sees enough widows caring enough to pay in their widows' mites (Lk.XXI, 1–4), does he inspire the benefactors capable of the larger donations. With God, spirit leads matter, and not the other way round. But do please pray for the three benefactors mentioned above, to whom we are all indebted. Especially I think of the house being able to serve as a refuge for priests to visit, as an island of sanity.

For indeed the second piece of good news is that the betrayal of the Faith by the leaders of the Newsociety of St Pius X is becoming clearer, little by little, to SSPX priests. One by one, some of the best of them are being alienated and then excluded by the Newsociety. It pretends that they are leaving of their own free will, or for purely personal reasons, or that they are being excluded for their disobedience. Never of course will these traitors in SSPX headquarters admit that it is their own treachery which is driving these priests out. Yet one after another they are declaring that their problem with the Newsociety is one of doctrine: the official SSPX documents of April 15 and July 14, 2012, and June 27, 2013, demonstrate that the Newsociety leaders are abandoning Archbishop Lefebvre's glorious fight for the Faith in exchange for a mess of Conciliar pottage.

Thus in South America a capable and devoted SSPX Prior is refusing a change of post

obviously designed to control and silence his opposition to the sell-out by Headquarters, and he writes to his District Superior that his refusal is for purely doctrinal reasons. In Austria a long-suffering and faithful former Prior gives five serious reasons for his departure from the SSPX, and all that the First Assistant finds to reply is that his reasons are “beneath consideration.” In France above all, a group of 12 priests have met together and issued a public declaration of allegiance to the doctrinal stand of Archbishop Lefebvre, and they have placed their priesthoods at the disposal of parents needing education for their children, of young men needing formation for the priesthood and of souls needing the sacraments. It has taken time for the priests in France to begin to react, but the reaction should be all the stronger for the delay. Archbishop Lefebvre was fond of quoting the French proverb which says that time does not respect anything done without it.

Have patience, dear readers. God is not in a hurry, nor is he mocked (Gal.VI, 7). If the SSPX misleaders try to console themselves that the priests departing or excluded represent only a small minority of the total of some 500 SSPX priests, how little they understand the power of truth! They have abandoned it, and it is abandoning them – inexorably. God have mercy on us all.

Kyrie eleison.

SEDEVACANTIST ANXIETY – I

No. CCCXLI (341)

January 25, 2014

Pope Francis is giving sedevacantism a new lease of life, but these “Comments” hold that nobody is obliged to hold the See to be vacant.

The words and deeds of Pope Francis since his election earlier last year have been so little Catholic and so outrageous, that the idea that recent popes have not really been Popes (“sedevacantism”) has been given a new lease of life. Notice that Pope Francis merely expresses more blatantly than his five predecessors the madness of Vatican II. The question remains whether any of the six Conciliar Popes (with the possible exception of John-Paul I) can really have been Vicars of Christ.

The question is not of prime importance. If they have not been Popes, still the Catholic Faith and morals by which I must “work out my salvation in fear and trembling” (Phil. II, 12) have not changed one iota. And if they have been Popes, still I cannot obey them whenever they have departed from that Faith and those morals, because “we ought to obey God rather than men” (Acts, V, 29). However I believe in offering answers to some of the sedevacantists’ arguments, because there are sedevacantists who seem to wish to make the vacant See of Rome into a dogma which Catholics must believe. In my opinion it is no such thing. “In things doubtful, liberty” (Augustine).

I think that the key to the problem of which sedevacantism is merely one expression is that Vatican II was a disaster without precedent in all the history of the Church of Jesus Christ, while at the same time it was the logical conclusion of a long decadence of the Catholic churchmen reaching back to the late Middle Ages. On the one hand the divine nature of the Catholic Church and the principles governing any of its crises, including the Conciliar crisis, cannot change. On the other hand the application of those principles must take into account the ever changing human circumstances within which those principles operate. The degree of human corruption today has no precedent.

Now two of the unchanging principles are that on the one hand the Church is indefectible because Our Lord promised that the gates of Hell would not prevail

against it (Mt.XVI, 18). On the other hand Our Lord also asked if he would find faith on earth at his Second Coming (Lk. XVIII, 8), an important quotation because it clearly suggests that the Church will almost completely have defected at the end of the world, just as it seems to be almost completely defecting in 2014. For indeed if we are not today living through the end of the world, we are surely living through the dress rehearsal for that end of the world, as Our Lady of La Salette, the Venerable Holzhauser and Cardinal Billot all suggest.

Therefore today, as at world's end, the defection can go very far. It cannot reach beyond the power of Almighty God to guarantee that his Church will never altogether disappear or fail, but it can reach as far as God will allow, in other words nothing need stop his Church from defecting almost completely. And just how far is that "almost completely"? God alone knows, and so time alone can tell, because none of us men are in the mind of God, and only the facts can reveal to us after the event the contents of the divine mind. But God does partly reveal his mind in Scripture.

Now as to the end of the world, many interpreters of Chapter XIII, 11–17 of the *Apocalypse* think that the lamb-like Second Beast serving the Antichrist is the authorities of the Church, because if those authorities resisted the Antichrist he could never prevail, as Scripture says he will. Then is it so extraordinary if in the dress rehearsal for the end of the world the Vicars of Christ talk and behave like enemies of Christ? Against this necessary background, next week's "Comments" will propose answers to some of the sedevacantists' main arguments.

Kyrie eleison.

SEDEVACANTIST ANXIETY – II

No. CCCXLII (342)

February 1, 2014

Five sedevacantist arguments are answered in such a way as to suggest that none of them are binding. “In things doubtful, liberty.”

1 Either one recognizes the Conciliar Popes all the way (like the liberals – God forbid!), or one refuses them all the way (like the sedevacantists). To recognize them partly, and partly not, is to pick and choose what one will recognize, as did Luther, as do all heretics (in Greek, “choosers”). That is true if one picks and chooses according to one’s own personal choice, but it is not true if, like Archbishop Lefebvre, one judges in accordance with Catholic Tradition, which can be found in 2000 years’ worth of Church documents. In that case one is judging with 260 Popes against a mere six, but that does not prove the invalidity of these six.

2 But the Conciliar Popes have poisoned the Faith and endangered the eternal salvation of millions upon millions of Catholics. That is contrary to the Church’s indefectibility. In the Arian crisis of the 4th century, Pope Liberius endangered the Faith by condemning St Athanasius and by backing Arian bishops in the East. For a few moments the Church’s indefectibility went not through the Pope but through his seeming adversary. However that meant neither that Liberius was not Pope nor that Athanasius was Pope. Similarly the indefectibility of the Church today goes through the faithful followers of the line taken by Archbishop Lefebvre, but that need not mean that Paul VI was not Pope.

3 What the bishops of the world teach, in union with the Pope, is the Church’s Ordinary Universal Magisterium, which is infallible. Now for the last 50 years the world’s bishops in union with the Conciliar Popes have taught Conciliar nonsense. Therefore these Popes cannot have been true Popes. If the Church’s Ordinary Magisterium were to go outside Tradition, it would no longer be “Ordinary,” but most extraordinary, because Church doctrine admits of no novelties, the “Universal” being in time as well as space. Now Conciliar doctrine goes way outside Tradition (e.g. religious liberty and ecumenism). Therefore doctrine proper to the Council does not come under the Ordinary Universal Magisterium, and it cannot serve to prove that the Conciliar Popes were not Popes.

4 Modernism is “the synthesis of all heresies”(Pius X). But the Conciliar Popes have all been “public and manifest” modernists, i.e. heretics of such a kind as St Robert Bellarmine declared cannot be members of the Church, let alone its head. See last week’s “Comments.” Things were much more clear, or “public and manifest,” in Bellarmine’s day, than they are amidst today’s confusion of minds and hearts. The objective heresy of the Conciliar Popes (i.e. what they say) is public and manifest, but not their subjective or formal heresy (i.e. their conscious and resolute intention to deny what they know to be unchangeable Catholic dogma). And to prove their formal heresy could only be done by a confrontation with the Church’s doctrinal authority, e.g. the Inquisition or the Holy Office, call it what one will (“A rose by any name would smell as sweet,” says Shakespeare). But the Pope is himself the Church’s highest doctrinal authority, above and behind today’s Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. How then can he be proved to be that kind of heretic that is incapable of being head of the Church?

5 But in that case the Church is in a hopeless mess! Again, see last week’s “Comments.” Men’s minds are today so universally messed up that God alone can straighten out the mess. But this objection may prove rather that he must intervene (and soon!) than that the messed up Popes are not Popes. Patience. God is putting us to the trial, as he has every right to do.

Kyrie eleison.

CHURCH'S INFALLIBILITY – I

No. CCCXLIII (343)

February 8, 2014

The Church's infallible Ordinary Magisterium is to the Pope's infallible Extraordinary Magisterium as dog is to tail, and not as tail is to dog.

Probably sedevacantists' main problem is the Church's infallibility (Conciliar Popes are horribly fallible, so how can they be Popes?). However, infallibility needs to be looked at for more than just to alleviate sedevacantism. The modern problem of preferring authority to truth is vast.

"Infallibility" means inability to err, or to fall into error. The First Vatican Council defined in 1870 that the pope cannot err when four conditions are present: he must (1) be speaking as Pope, (2) on a question of Faith or morals, (3) in a definitive fashion, and (4) with the clear intention of binding the whole Church. Any such teaching belongs to what is called his "Extraordinary" Magisterium, because on the one hand Popes rarely engage all four conditions, and on the other hand he teaches many other truths which cannot err or be wrong because they have always been taught by the Church, and therefore they belong to what Vatican I called the Church's "Ordinary Universal Magisterium," also infallible. The question is, how does the Pope's Extraordinary Magisterium relate to the Church's Ordinary Magisterium?

Mother Church teaches that the Deposit of Faith, or public Revelation, was complete at the death of the last Apostle alive, say, around 105 AD. Since then no further truth has been added, or could be added, to that Deposit, or body of revealed truths. Then no "extraordinary" definition can add one iota of truth to that Deposit, it only adds, for the sake of believers, certainity to some truth already belonging to the Deposit, but whose belonging had not been clear enough beforehand. In a fourfold order comes firstly, an objective REALITY, independent of any human mind, such as the historical fact of the Mother of God's having been conceived without original sin. Secondly comes TRUTH in any mind conforming itself to that reality. Only thirdly comes an infallible DEFINITION when a Pope engages all four conditions to define that truth. And fourthly arises from that definition CERTAINTY for believers as to that truth. Thus whereas reality generates the truth, a Definition merely creates

certainty as to that truth.

But the reality and its truth already belonged to the Ordinary Magisterium, because there is no question of any Pope defining infallibly a truth outside of the Deposit of Faith. Therefore the Ordinary Magisterium is to the Extraordinary Magisterium as dog is to tail, and not as tail to dog! The problem is that the Definition of 1870 gave such prestige to the Extraordinary Magisterium that the Ordinary Magisterium began to pale in comparison, to the point that Catholics, even theologians, scratch around to fabricate for it an infallibility like that of the Extraordinary Magisterium. But that is foolishness. The Extraordinary presupposes the Ordinary Magisterium, existing only to give certainty (4) to a truth (2) already taught by the Ordinary Magisterium.

Let the point be illustrated from a snow-capped mountain. The mountain in no way depends on the snow, except for it to be made even more visible than it already is. On the contrary the snow depends completely on the mountain to be where it, the snow, is. Similarly the Extraordinary Magisterium does no more for the Ordinary Magisterium than to make it more clearly or certainly visible. As winter closes in, so the snowline descends. As charity grows cold in modern times, so more definitions of the Extraordinary Magisterium may become necessary, but that does not make them the perfection of the Church's Magisterium. On the contrary, they signal a weakness of believers' grasp of the truths of their Faith. The healthier a man is, the fewer pills he needs. Next week, the application both to sedevacantism and to the present crisis of the SSPX.

Kyrie eleison.

CHURCH'S INFALLIBILITY – II

No. CCCXLIV (344)

February 15, 2014

The Ordinary Magisterium is indeed infallible, but its infallibility comes from God, and not from the Extraordinary Magisterium.

Much needs to be said about the Church's infallibility, especially to correct illusions arising (by mistake) from the Definition of Papal infallibility in 1870. Today for instance sedevacantists and liberals think that their positions are wholly opposed, but do they stop for a moment to see how similarly they think?—Major: Popes are infallible. Minor: Conciliar Popes are liberal. Liberal Conclusion: we must become liberal. Sedevacantist Conclusion: they cannot be Popes. The error is neither in the logic, nor in the Minor. It can only be in a misunderstanding on both their parts of infallibility in the Major. Once again, modern men put authority above truth.

Eternal God is Truth itself, absolutely infallible. In created time, through his Incarnate Son, he instituted his Church with a doctrine for the salvation of human souls. Coming from him that doctrine could only be inerrant, but to keep it free from the errors of the human churchmen to whom he would entrust it, his Son promised them the “spirit of truth” to guide them “for ever” (Jn. XIV, 16). For indeed without some such guarantee, how could God require of men, on pain of eternal damnation, to believe in his Son, in his doctrine and in his Church (Mk.XVI, 16)?

Yet even from churchmen God will not take away that free-will to err which he gave them. And he will allow that freedom to go as far as they wish, short of their making his Truth inaccessible to men. That reaches far, and it includes a number of highly defective Popes, but God's reach is still farther than the wickedness of men (Isaiah LIX, 1,2). At Vatican II for instance, Church error went a long way, without however God's allowing his Church to be wholly defectible in its presentation to men of the inerrant Truth coming from his own infallibility. Even the Conciliar Popes have told many Catholic truths alongside their Conciliar errors.

But how then can I, a simple soul, tell the difference between their truths and their errors? Firstly, if I am truly looking for God with an upright heart, he will guide me to him, as the Bible says in many places. And secondly, God's doctrine being as

unchangeable as God, it must be the doctrine that I find (nearly) all his churchmen to have taught and handed down in (nearly) all places and at (nearly) all times, best known as Tradition. From the beginning of the Church, that handing down has been the surest test of what Our Lord himself taught. Down the ages inerrant Tradition has been the work of millions of churchmen. It has been that for which God endowed his Church as a whole, and not just the Popes, with the guidance of the infallible Holy Ghost.

Here is, so to speak, the cake of Church infallibility upon which the Popes' solemn Definitions are merely the icing, precious and necessary, the peak of the Church's infallibility, but not its mountain bulk. Notice firstly that Definitions by the Popes' Extraordinary Magisterium existed not only from 1870 but from the beginning of the Church, and they existed not to make Tradition true but merely to make certain what belonged to Tradition and what did not, whenever the erring of men had made that uncertain. Sensing truth, Archbishop Lefebvre rightly preferred inerrant Tradition to gravely erring Popes. Never having understood him, like all modern liberals not sensing truth, his successors are in the process of preferring erring Popes to inerrant Tradition. Underestimating truth and overestimating the Popes, sedevacantists wholly repudiate the erring Popes and can be tempted to quit the Church altogether. Lord, have mercy!

Kyrie eleison.

FATAL HUMANISING

No. CCCXLV (345)

February 22, 2014

The problem of sedevacantism is the problem of the modern world & too much consideration of man, too little consideration of God.

Some Catholics who hold that the Apostolic See is vacant protest strongly against recent issues of these “Comments” which seem to put the universal heresy of liberalism on an equal footing with the particular opinion of sedevacantism. But whereas these “Comments” constantly excoriate the plague of liberalism, surely they have recently done no more than argue that nobody is obliged to be a sedevacantist, which, considering what a sterilising trap sedevacantism proves in some cases to be, is surely a very moderate position to take.

However, the “Comments” do hold that sedevacantism, while admirable as an effort to combat liberalism, is at best an inadequate means of doing so, because it shares with liberals one of their basic errors, namely the exaggeration of papal infallibility. In its full depth this error takes us to the heart of today’s unprecedented crisis of the Church, which is why the “Comments” will insist on the question, while begging pardon of any readers unduly bored or offended. The whole Church is at stake, and not just the sensibilities of these or those of its members.

That full depth is mankind’s slow but steady turning away over the last 700 years from God, from his Son and from his Church. At the height of the Middle Ages Catholics had a clear and strong faith, grasping the oneness and exclusivity of the objective God and his non-contradictory Truth. Dante had no problem putting Popes in his Inferno. But as down the centuries man put himself more and more at the centre of things, so God lost his absolute transcendence above all creatures, and truth became more and more relative, no longer to God’s authority but instead to man’s.

Within the Church, take for example the 13th of the 17 “Rules for thinking with the Church” from St Ignatius of Loyola’s famous book of the Spiritual Exercises, praised by countless Popes ever since, and no doubt responsible for helping to save millions of souls. Ignatius writes: “To be right in everything, we ought always to hold that the white which I see, is black, if the Hierarchical Church so decides it.” Such a position

might support the churchmen's authority in the short run, but did it not run a serious risk of detaching it from truth in the long run?

Indeed by the late 19th century liberalism had become so strong that the Church had to support its own authority by the Definition in 1870 of its Magisterium when operating at full power, namely whenever 1) a Pope 2) defines 3) a point of Faith or morals 4) so as to bind the whole Church. But thinking too humanly since then, too many Catholics, instead of relating this Extraordinary Magisterium to God and to the unchanging truth of the Church's Ordinary Magisterium, have tended to lend to the human person of the Pope an infallibility coming from, and belonging to, God alone. This humanising process generated a creeping infallibility which almost inevitably resulted in the preposterous claim of Paul VI to be able to remould the Church's Tradition in the name of a "Solemn Ordinary Magisterium." The great majority of Catholics allowed him to get away with it, and to this day a mass of them are becoming day by day liberals as they follow the Conciliar Popes, while a small minority of Catholics are driven to denying that those responsible for the Conciliar nonsense can be Popes at all.

In brief, I personally have respect for many sedevacantists, insofar as they believe in the Church and are desperate for a solution to an infinitely serious problem of the Church., but in my opinion they need to look higher and deeper – the infinite height and depth of God himself.

Kyrie eleison.

TRUTH FIRST

No. CCCXLVI (346)

March 1, 2014

Galatians I, 8–9 is a classic text to prove the priority of truth over authority, i.e. of Catholic Tradition over today's Rome.

There must be many objections to the argument of recent issues of these “Comments” that, divine truth being prior to human teachers, then the fallibility of Popes need not concern us all that much because the true Faith is behind, beyond and above them. But here is a classic objection: the Truth in itself may be above them, but to us human beings it only comes through them – “faith is by hearing” (Rom.X, 17). Thus Our Lord entrusted to Peter (i.e. the Popes) the task of confirming his brethren in the faith (Lk.XXII, 31–32). So to us Catholics the teachers are prior to the Truth which we cannot receive without them. Moreover the Holy Ghost guides them (Jn.XVI, 13), so how can I possibly tell if or when he is not doing so?

Also in Scripture lies the answer. St. Paul writes to a flock which he has instructed in the Faith: “Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.” And the point is so important that St Paul immediately repeats it: “As we said before, so now I say again: If anyone preach to you a gospel, besides that which you have received, let him be anathema” (Gal.I, 8–9)

But, a Galatian might have objected, why should we believe your gospel on your first visit to Galatia and not an eventually different one on your second? St. Paul immediately gives a first reason: “The gospel which was preached by me is not according to man. For neither did I receive it of man, nor did I learn it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ” (Gal.I, 11–12). And St Paul confirms this by narrating how little contact he had with those who might have taught him, the other Apostles, before he began preaching (I, 15–19), a fact obviously verifiable by them, and he swears to the Galatians that he is not lying (I, 20). A second reason he gives a little later, which is the miracles and experience of the Holy Spirit (III, 2–5) that the Galatians themselves had witnessed as the direct result of the preaching of Paul's first visit.

Thus Paul proves that God both taught him, and confirmed for the Galatians, the gospel of that first visit, and the contradiction between it and any different gospel the Galatians would be not only able but also obliged to discern for themselves, if they wished to save their souls. And no matter if (I,8) the preacher of the different gospel were an angel or Paul himself – or a Pope! – the Galatians would still have the absolute duty to stay with Paul's first gospel. The truth that had been set before them (III,1) the Galatians had recognized and accepted it (III, 3), just as one recognizes that 2 and 2 are 4, so it would have priority over any teacher eventually contradicting it, whatever authority to teach he might appear to have (I,9).

Thus Archbishop Lefebvre used to say that for the 19 centuries between St Paul and Vatican II the Church had preached exactly the same gospel, coming from God and ever and again confirmed by him. That gospel is, as revealed by God, Revelation; as handed down by churchmen, Tradition; as taught with authority by the Church, its Ordinary and Extraordinary Magisterium. Between that gospel and Vatican II the contradiction is obvious, so we must accept and believe Tradition, if we wish to save our souls, whatever the apparent authorities of the Church may say to the contrary. So help us God. How then can the Archbishop's own Society of St Pius X be officially seeking reconciliation with the authorities of Vatican II?

Kyrie eleison.

FIFTIESISM OBSERVED

No. CCCXLVII (347)

March 8, 2014

A lack of resistance to the liberal slide of the SSPX is partly explained by souls only wanting to return to the 1950's.

If there is, at least up till now, relatively little reaction from within the Society of St Pius X to its complete change of direction under Bishop Fellay, that is because of the desire to return to the Catholicism of the 1950's. So observes a Catholic attending Mass at an SSPX Chapel in the English-speaking world. She wrote to me recently:—

“Why is there no “Resistance” in our part of the world? I think I’ve figured it out. You’ve mentioned many times that most of the original leaders of the Society of St Pius X never really understood Archbishop Lefebvre. Locally, I think that that applies to many of our original chapel founders here, who are the ones clinging to the Society and to its present leaders. How come? Why don’t they take action, when what they fought so long and hard for is threatened with destruction from within?

“On Sunday, an elderly lady summed it up for me. As she and her husband see it, they strove valiantly through the 1970s into the early 80s, and the fruit of their labours is the chapel itself. The Mass with all the outward trappings, the property, the buildings, the pews, the statues, the vestments – this is what is threatened by the mere existence of the Resistance! They fought all those years to restore for themselves the Catholicism of their youth. For them, it’s NOT a question of doctrine at all. The woman is member of a Third Order, yet she believes doctrinal matters are for priests and bishops, not laity. For example, to study Papal encyclicals is meddling in affairs that God assigned to the hierarchy.

“I asked if they see a need to understand their Faith, if individual souls do not answer to God for knowing their Faith? Their response was sincere, I believe, but to me it was astonishing. They said, ‘No! The responsibility of the Catholic is to obey his superiors.’ And if the superiors are in error? ‘Obey anyway! To do otherwise is rebellion.’ It is for a Catholic ‘a sign of rebellion’ to even question his superiors ‘in matters that do not concern him,’ i.e. doctrine. If the superior is wrong, God will judge him – ‘You will never go wrong obeying the priest.’ So there you have it. The

Resistants are rebels, disobedient, disrespectful. How dare they question the superior? How dare they presume to study doctrine, to ask questions of their superiors about it? The Resistants are evil, not because they are doctrinally wrong, but because their words and actions threaten the Catholicism of the 1950's.

“But blind obedience is ridiculous! What are we lambs to do when the Shepherd is struck and the sheep are scattered? Pretend all is well. and let ourselves be devoured by wolves in the name of obedience? What can one say to such people? They are wilfully ignorant in the belief that wilful ignorance is a virtue! Where does such a mindset come from? What error crept into the Church to make Catholics switch off their minds? All I can say is that if the SSPX is left with flocks of lobotomised sheep, it will be easy for Rome to wipe out the last fortress of Tradition! The SSPX chapels need only to be handed over to the jurisdiction of the local bishop by formal agreement, or by de facto cooperation with Novus Ordo priests, which we have seen locally.”

Notice her evocation of the possibility of Rome absorbing the SSPX no longer by any clear-cut agreement, but by a gradual merger. It is a real danger. I wonder if that is not what SSPX HQ is being advised to do by its “new friends” in Rome.

Kyrie eleison.

RESISTANCE POLICY – I

No. CCCXLVIII (348)

March 15, 2014

When the Shepherd is struck, the truths of salvation must be upheld inviolate, but “The wind must be tempered to the shorn lambs.”

In today’s disastrous state of Church and world there are, amongst others, two central principles in play, the one permanent and primary, the other temporary and secondary, but both are central. Their interplay should be decisive to guide our actions.

The permanent principle is that “Without faith it is impossible to please God” (Heb. XI, 6). This is because all men come from God endowed with a free-will which they are meant so to use as to be able to go to God when they die, and enjoy the beatific vision of God for eternity. These obligatory terms of our earthly existence constitute an extremely generous offer on God’s part, given how relatively little is required on our part (Is. LXIV, 4), but the very least that we can do, a bare beginning, is to recognize his existence. Given the goodness of his Creation all around us, it is “inexcusable” not to recognize it (Rom. I, 20), and therefore without the most elementary faith in him it is impossible to please him.

The temporary principle is that the Shepherd is struck and the sheep are scattered (Zach. XIII, 7), text quoted by Our Lord in the Garden of Gethsemane (Mt. XXVI, 31). After 4,000 years of man’s repeated decadence, God took a human nature to found a Church to enable men to save their souls for the last 2,000 years of men’s existence on this earth. For the first thousand of those years the decadence was seriously interrupted, but after a few more centuries it picked up again to the point that with Vatican II the very leaders of God’s own Church, the Popes on whom it was designed to depend, became seriously infected by the decadence. Thereupon it became much more difficult for men to see how God meant them to save their souls.

Therefore on the one hand, objectively speaking, the permanent truths of salvation have not been changed one little bit by the fall of the Conciliar Popes, and these truths must be maintained if any souls at all are still to be saved. It was Archbishop Lefebvre’s glory to uphold those truths against the fallen churchmen and world, while

it is his successors' disgrace to be compromising them for the sake of rejoining those churchmen and their world.

On the other hand, subjectively speaking, that disgrace is mitigated by the temporary eclipse of those great truths, due to the fall of the Popes. It is not easy even for bishops to see straight when the Bishop of Rome is seeing crooked. It follows that those who by the grace of God – and by nothing else – see straight, must have a 360-degree compassion for souls caught in a confusion not entirely their own fault. Therefore, it seems to me, if James is convinced that to save his soul he must stay in the Newchurch, I need not hammer him to get out of it. If Clare is persuaded that there is no grave problem within the Society of St Pius X, I need not ram down her throat why there is. And if John can see no way to keep the Faith without believing that the See of Rome is vacant, I need urge upon him no more than that that belief is not obligatory.

Yet in all this scattering of the sheep, somebody must maintain and make available to them the objective Truth if the poor stones are not to have to do it (Lk. XIX, 40), because upon at least the seeking of that Truth depends the saving of our souls. However, let Catholics seek it with all due regard for the blindness of their fellow-sheep, for at least as long as the Shepherd remains struck.

Kyrie eleison.

ARK'S REALITY

No. CCCXLIX (349)

March 22, 2014

A recent French film, accessible on YouTube, presents historical and factual evidence for Noah's Ark still today existing, high up on Mount Ararat.

` If anybody doubts that a worldwide chastisement is possible, such as Our Lady of Akita warned us of, let them remember it happened once 5,000 years ago, so it can happen again. And if they doubt that the worldwide Flood of Noah's time actually happened, let them watch on YouTube the fascinating 53-minute film entitled "L'Arche de Noé et le Déluge: Preuves Historiques et Scientifiques." Alas. in English YouTube seems to have no equivalent film on Noah's Ark, but rather a good deal of disinformation. God's enemies work hard to keep away from us such a sensational proof of the truth of the Bible as is the real existence of the Ark of Noah.

It nestles some 4,600 meters high up in a canyon on the snowline of Mount Ararat on the Turko-Armenian border. It is difficult of access because for most of the year it is covered in ice, and from above avalanches threaten at all times of year, while below there is danger from robbers and local civil wars. But after referring to the identical account of the Flood in multiple ancient languages, always with the same name of Noah, the French film continues with a long list of known visitors to the Ark down the ages, 34 of whose descriptions of what they saw are remarkably similar, according to the film.

The list begins with a Chaldean priest about half a millennium before Christ. It includes a Christian bishop in 360 AD and the famous Italian explorer, Marco Polo, in 1269. In 1840 a huge earthquake carved the canyon out of the side of the mountain where the Ark now rests and broke it into two pieces, now 30 yards apart. In the 19th and 20th centuries there followed numerous visitors to the Ark, and during and after World War II several American pilots flying over the mountain clearly recognized a huge man-made boat, dark in colour, shaped like a barge. They had no doubt they were seeing Noah's Ark. Finally in our own time, in 2007, a team of Turkish explorers penetrated inside the Ark and took film footage which can also be found on YouTube, independently of the French film.

The film concludes with fascinating speculation of modern scientists and geologists on the mass of water which Scripture says drowned the highest (then) mountains to a depth of 7 meters (Gen. VII, 20). Especially worthy of note in Scripture is how it says that the water not only rained from on high but also burst up from below (Gen. VII, 11: VIII, 2). A persuasive explanation is offered on the film by an American engineer, Dr Walter Brown, who posits that before the Flood there were huge subterranean caverns of water, interconnected, some 800 meters deep, fiercely compressed beneath the earth's surface crust of rock, 10 miles thick. It was enough for a split in that crust to run around the earth in two hours, and a mass of that water would explode upwards from below, changing the face of the earth, and explaining many features, Dr Brown argues, of the earth's geology as we know it today. Altogether fascinating.

But how many people today want to know that God exists, that sin matters, and that the wrecking of environments is one way in which sin is punished? The film says that in the late 19th century, despite the number of visitors to the Ark, people were more interested in Evolution getting rid of God than in the Ark clearly pointing to him. True, God promised Noah that he would never again punish by a flood of water (Gen. IX, 15), but that does not exclude a worldwide rain of fire. Our Lady of Akita spoke in 1973 of the latter hanging over our heads. Certainly sin is today careering out of control, worldwide.

Kyrie eleison.

SUBSTITUTE RELIGION

No. CCCL (350)

March 29, 2014

The famous Six Million of World War II have been turned into a veritable religion – does it take an atheist to recognize that?

Two months ago a self-declared atheist celebrated in France his 85th birthday, to whom all theists of the true religion owe a serious debt of thanks, because in today's world of lies Professor Robert Faurisson has been a powerful defender of truth. I for one might wish that many more believers in the true God would have his intelligence and honesty in discerning the truth, and his courage to tell it.

For instance, whether or not it is a historical fact that there were six million victims of gassing in gas chambers of the Third Reich, Prof. Faurisson insists on treating it as a historical question to be settled by the facts and scientific evidence, and not by emotion and legislation – what could be more reasonable? And yet on this particular question a mass of our contemporaries will not listen to reason. Are their minds still functioning? Our warm gratitude goes to the Professor for bringing an excellent and scholarly mind to bear on a historical question as a question of history and not of something else.

Something else? Again, whether or not the Six Million are a historical reality, it is the Professor who states that they have in any case acquired the status of a secular religion. Does it take a supposedly irreligious man to discern what serves as the main religion of our times? I might wish a few more Catholics would have the gumption to see and say what is today's main rival to their true religion. Here is a very brief overview of an article written on the subject in 2008 by Professor Faurisson:—

The Six Million constitute a lay religion with its own dogma, commandments, decrees, prophets, high priests and Saints: St Anne (Frank), St Simon (Wiesenthal), St Elie (Wiesel). It has its holy places, its rituals and its pilgrimages. It has its temples and its relics (bars of soap, piles of shoes, etc.), its martyrs, heroes, miracles and miraculous survivors (millions of them), its golden legend and its righteous people. Auschwitz is its Golgotha, Hitler is its Satan. It dictates its law to the nations. Its heart beats in Jerusalem, at the Yad Veshem monument.

It is a new religion that has enjoyed a meteoric growth since World War II. It has conquered the West and is setting out to conquer the world. Whereas the progress of scientific thinking in our consumer society has weakened the grip of all the classic religions by making people more and more sceptical as to the truth of religion's stories and the promises religion holds out, the new religion prospers to the point that anybody caught denying its basic dogma is branded as a "Revisionist," is cast out of the community, and is treated like only heretics used to be treated. It is in effect a religion, and it is today a major instrument, and, one might say, the popular religion of the godless New World Order.

The Professor argues that this success can be attributed to its resorting to the consumer society's own techniques of advertising and selling. Here I think he does lack the religious perspective. Surely the apostasy of the once Christian nations is the main explanation. Christ is God. When God is pushed out, he leaves behind him a huge void which must be filled by something. The promoters of the new religion have by their history a matchless instinct for the fabrication of substitute religions. But be that as it may, I would invite believers to pray for the unbelieving Professor so that he may collect the divine reward which, humanly seen, he deserves for the heroic services which he has rendered to the truth.

Kyrie eleison.

CANONISATIONS UNREAL

No. CCCLI (351)

April 5, 2014

No Catholic need believe that the imminent canonisation of Conciliar Popes will be infallible, because it will proceed from mind-rot.

The “canonisation” of two Conciliar Popes, John XXIII and John-Paul II, is scheduled for the last Sunday of this month, and many believing Catholics are scared stiff. They know that the Conciliar Popes have been (objective) destroyers of the Church. They know that the Church holds canonisations to be infallible. Are they going to be forced to believe that John XXIII and John-Paul II are Saints? It boggles the mind. But it need not do so.

In August of last year these “Comments” stated the fact that Newchurch “canonisations” are such a different reality from pre-Conciliar canonisations that no Catholic need believe that the post-conciliar canonisations are infallible. I was not wrong, but while I stated the fact that this is so, I did not give the reason why, which is a superior way of knowing something. On the contrary in a retreat conference, perhaps of 1989, Archbishop Lefebvre gave the deep-down reason why. This reason – modernist mind-rot – is crucial to understand correctly the whole Conciliar Revolution.

The Archbishop said that like a mass of modern men, the Conciliar Popes do not believe in any truth being stable. For instance John-Paul II’s formation was based on truth evolving, moving with the times, progressing with the advance of science, etc. Truth never being fixed is the reason why in 1988 John-Paul II condemned the SSPX’s Episcopal Consecrations, because they sprang from a fixed and not living or moving idea of Catholic Tradition. For indeed Catholics hold, for example, every word in the Credo to be unchangeable, because the words have been hammered out over the ages to express as perfectly as possible the unchanging truths of the Faith, and these words have been infallibly defined by the Church’s Popes and Councils.

True canonisations are another example: (1) the Pope pronounces as Pope, (2) such and such a person to be a model of faith and morals, (3) once and for all (nobody used to get uncanonised), (4) for all the Church to accept as such a model. As such,

canonisations used to fulfil the four conditions of infallible Church teaching, and they were held to be infallible. But this Catholic idea of an unchangeable truth is inconceivable for fluid modern minds like those of the Conciliar Popes. For them, truth is life, a life developing, evolving, growing towards perfection. How then can a Conciliar Pope perform, let alone impose, an infallible canonisation?

The Archbishop imagines how a Conciliar Pope might react to the idea of his having done any such thing: “Oh no! If ever in the future it turns out that the person I canonised did not have all the qualities required, well, some successor of mine may well declare that I made a declaration on that person’s virtue but not a once and for all definition of their sanctity.” Meanwhile the “canonising” Pope’s “declaration” has made the President of the local Republic and the local Christians happy, and he has given them all an excuse to have a party to celebrate.

If one thinks about it, this explanation of the Archbishop applies to the Newchurch across the board. What we have in Vatican II is the demanding beauty of God’s unchangeable Truth, which leads to Heaven, being replaced by the undemanding ugliness of man’s fluid fantasy, which may lead to Hell but enables man, as he thinks, to take the place of God. The key step in this process is the unhooking of the mind from reality. When the process is applied today to the Church as modernism, the results are so totally unlike what went before that the new realities absolutely call for new names: Newchurch, Newcanonisations, Newsaints, etc. After all, are not the Conciliarists proud of making everything new?

Kyrie eleison.

FRENCH TOUR

No. CCCLII (352)

April 12, 2014

Outside, Archbishop, of its structure bent,
Your noble work continues, as you meant.

Good news again, this time from France, once more small in quantity but high in quality. A handful of good priests are gathering together and taking action to make sure that the Faith will continue to be defended along the lines laid down by Archbishop Lefebvre, steering between sedevacantism on the right and conciliarism – from above. SSPX HQ will be left to disarm its followers, while a remainder of happy priests will continue to take arms with the true religion for the next stage in their persecution.

This is what I observed on a fourth lecture tour since last autumn of centres in France where the laity are interested in the anti-liberal doctrine of the Catholic Popes between Pius VI (1717–1799) and Pius XII (1876–1958). That doctrine was not new, even at the beginning of the century and a half over which it was elaborated. It was merely that particular part of the Church’s timeless teaching which needed to be refreshed from the moment when the Christian social order of 15 centuries was undermined and supplanted by the French Revolution of 1789.

That Revolution was Freemasonic liberalism making war on God by seeking to overthrow throne and altar. Since then the Catholic thrones have been virtually overthrown by “democracy,” while the Catholic altars were virtually overthrown at Vatican II by that Council’s conversion to the religion of man. Archbishop Lefebvre however, cleaving to the religion of God, wished that his seminarians would be thoroughly familiar with the Church’s anti-Revolutionary doctrine in order to know how to take their Catholic stand in the midst of a liberal world. It follows that Catholic lay-folk who can see how the Archbishop’s Society of St Pius X is being cunningly transformed into the Newsociety, are interested in the Popes’ Encyclical Letters of those 150 years before Vatican II. On the first of my four lecture tours there were five stops. On the latest, between end March and early April, there were nine, and there risk being more invitations. There are, all the time, more French lay-folk

waking up to how the Society is being misled.

Alas, all too many SSPX priests are still spellbound by a master of seduction, lost in his worldly dream. I met a few of them on this latest tour. They are no doubt good men, they have been good priests, they have their eyes open and see many things, but when they are exposed once more to that seducer, their vision clouds over and their will is puzzled. The Greek verb “diaballein” from which come the English words “diabolical” and “devil,” means to turn upside down, to throw into confusion.

These confused priests contrast with the half dozen mentioned above who have seen clear and are taking action on what they see. The tension by which they were tortured for as long as they tried to remain loyal to diabolical leaders is a thing of the past. They are serene, and happily making plans for the continuation of the Archbishop’s work. Fr. de Mérode, ordained many years ago, has left the SSPX of his own accord, has bought one house in Lourdes and is buying another in the Southwest of France. These will act both as bases for an apostolate to many interested souls in the region, and as refuges for priests needing somewhere to recover. I can add that I met a venerable soul in Lyon who is offering a studio of hers in that city to any priest similarly looking for a roof. Also the “Resistance” House in Broadstairs, England, is now open and can receive priestly visitors. One has already come by. Discretion guaranteed.

Outside, Archbishop, of its structure bent

Your noble work continues, as you meant.

Kyrie eleison.

BALANCE PROPOSED

No. CCCLIII (353)

April 19, 2014

True priests should neither flirt with Rome today,
Nor cut the Pope out of their Mass, I say.

“Keep therefore and do the things which the Lord God hath commanded you: you shall not go aside neither to the right hand nor to the left.” This instruction from the Lord God to be passed on by Moses to the Israelites (Deut.V, 32) is certainly valid for God’s Chosen People of the New Testament (Rom. IX, 25–26), but it is not so easy to apply in our own time when the Shepherd of the New Testament is struck, and we sheep are scattered (Zech.XIII, 7). Is the Pope so lightly struck that Catholics need not take care how they obey him? Or is he so seriously struck that he cannot be Pope? In any case the sheep are scattered and will remain so, until Russia is consecrated to the Immaculate Heart.

Meanwhile, as it seems to me, a letter published in the latest issue of the Angelus, official magazine of the Society of St Pius X in the USA, goes astray to the left. Fr. S. has several reasons for urging the SSPX to put itself “in the hands . . . of the Pope as soon as possible.” Firstly, to think that the Roman churchmen are intentional destroyers of the Church is implicit sedevacantism. But I need be no sedevacantist, implicit or explicit, to recall that their subjective intentions no way lessen the objective damage that they have done to the Church, and would do to the SSPX, if it came under their control. Secondly, for the SSPX to wait until the Romans’ full doctrinal conversion to put itself into their hands, is unrealistic. But one heresy is enough to make an enemy of the Faith, and modernism is an all-embracing heresy (Pascendi, Pius X). Too much contact with the Romans has already seduced the SSPX’s leaders.

Thirdly, the SSPX must give back to Rome as soon as possible the doctrine and practice of the true Faith. But if Rome were still only half modernist, such a giving back would be to throw pearls before swine (Mt.VII, 6). Fourthly, the SSPX has for so long kept its distance from Rome that it risks losing all Catholic sense of hierarchy, obedience and authority. But the true Faith must be kept at a safe distance from all-embracing heresy. If the heresy is not my fault, God can look after my Catholic

senses, so long as I am faithful to him, for 40 years or more in the desert, just as he looked after the faithful Israelites (Exod. – Deut.). And fifthly, the so-called “Resistance” is dividing and weakening the SSPX’s true resistance to Conciliar Rome. But unity around any non-doctrinal understanding with modernists will be unity around error, fatal for Archbishop Lefebvre’s SSPX. In brief, Fr. S. has lost sight of just how seductive and deadly for the Faith is the error of modernism.

On the other hand, as it seems to me, a priest now refusing any longer to mention the Pope’s name in the Canon of the Mass is in danger of going astray to the right. If I see the deadly danger of modernism to the Faith, certainly I see the enormous objective damage done to the Church by Conciliar Popes. But can I truthfully say that there is nothing at all still Catholic left in them? For example, as Fr. S. would say, do they not still have at least good subjective intentions? Have they not all at least meant to serve the Church? In which case can I not celebrate Mass in union with whatever is still Catholic in them? The mainstream Church may be sick unto death, but I for one could not maintain that there is nothing Catholic whatsoever still happening within it. It is not yet completely dead.

“In things certain, unity. In things doubtful, liberty. In all things, charity.”

Kyrie eleison.

RESISTANCE POLICY – II

No. CCCLIV (354)

April 26, 2014

All of today's world feels that it is nice,
But in God's eyes that's self-deceiving vice.

The Faith must be preserved despite the Shepherd being struck (cf. EC 348). If there was one man given to us by God to show us how to keep the Faith in stricken times, by preserving the true sacrifice of the Mass and the true Catholic priesthood, that man was certainly Archbishop Lefebvre (1905–1991). And since the disaster wrought upon the Church by the Conciliar Shepherds has not essentially changed since his time, then what he said and wrote applies essentially today, and any newcomer to the disaster cannot do better than read and study his words.

However, the disaster has also grown much worse since his death, and any so-called movement of “Resistance” today will do well to learn the lessons that are there to be learned from the threatening fall of that Society of St Pius X which it was the Archbishop's stupendous achievement to found, within the collapsing mainstream Church, for the preservation of the Faith. Why is the leadership of the SSPX now taking it in a direction different from the Archbishop's, a direction that must lead to the SSPX's entirely similar collapse?

Because, in my opinion, the leaders which the SSPX chose for itself after the Archbishop's death in 1991 at the General Chapters of 1994 and 2006, never took the full measure of the Conciliar disaster, because they were children of the undermined 1950's or the Revolutionary 1960's and later still. Having drunk in the Revolution with their mothers' milk, so to speak, they never understood how it wrecks from within churchmen still seeming Catholic without. In brief, these leaders have either never studied modernism, or never understood what they studied, or have been too “pious” or “supernatural” to think that it could apply to the mainstream churchmen in front of them.

Thus where Archbishop Lefebvre saw clearly that the Conciliar Church, by losing all four marks of the Catholic Church (one, holy, catholic, apostolic), was not the Catholic Church, Bishop Fellay (Superior General since 1994) and Fr Nicholas

Pfluger (First Assistant since 2006) insist today that there can only be one Church, and so the Conciliar Church is the Catholic Church. Naturally then, where the Archbishop kept the SSPX at a safe distance from the Conciliar Church, Bishop Fellay and Fr Pfluger want to abolish that distance and bring the SSPX back within that Church which is Conciliar. And neither Bishop Fellay nor Fr Pfluger will feel Catholic until they have achieved that end.

But the Faith is firstly in the mind and not in the feelings. It follows that whoever has, for whatever reason, begun to recognize that the present leadership of the SSPX is on the wrong track, must continue by studying the total problem of the Revolution, of modernism and of Vatican II. That is a tall order, because one can have a text-book knowledge of the Revolution and still not recognize it right under one's nose. I feel so nice when I feel that everybody else is nice that I lose from view the objective falsity of almost all of us as seen by God. One may say that it requires a special grace from God to see that falsity as he sees it, without losing one's compassion, but a soul can obtain that grace if it seeks God seriously, especially in prayer.

God is good to those that seek him, says Scripture in many places. Assuming he exists, what could he be other than supremely good to those that seek him?

Kyrie eleison.

FAREWELL, SSPX

No. CCCLV (355)

May 3, 2014

Catholics, when you see how Rome fulfils
A cry for recognition, take to the hills!

Bad news from France: the 40-year fight for the Faith by the Society of St Pius X against the modernists in Rome is virtually over. Oh, the Society's priories, schools, seminaries and associated convents and monasteries will continue to function, to provide for at least a while valid sacraments and decent doctrine, maintaining all the appearances of Tradition, but the essential fight for the complete Faith will be censored, or self-censored, out of existence. It looks like being only a limited number of priests more that will have the understanding of Archbishop Lefebvre's work and the necessary courage to break ranks and take to the hills.

The news is that the modernists in Rome are offering to the Society a « recognition by tolerance » without the need for any formal agreement or signed document such as raised within the SSPX so much opposition to a deal with Rome in the spring and early summer of 2012. Here is the essence of how the Society's Second Assistant, Fr. Alain Nély, expressed it, with enthusiasm, to two members of religious Orders three months ago: « The solution for the SSPX will be its unilateral recognition by Rome . . .we will not be asked to sign anything . . .to see how things evolve . . .we shall see. »

To prevent such a revelation from spreading, the Society's Superior General wrote to the two religious concerned that they had misunderstood Fr. Nély's remarks because there was no kind of « agreement » in view. Of course not. Therein lies the cunning of the proposed « recognition » without signature. It will allow numbers of SSPX priests to pretend that nothing will have changed so that they can continue their ministry just as before. Thus, as reported, Bishop Fellay himself recently told SSPX seminarians in Zaitzkofen: « There is no question of signing any agreement, etc., etc.» However, ten minutes later, « But if Rome proposes a recognition of tolerance for us, that's a different matter, that would be very good. »

And so there is every likelihood, sooner rather than later, that a large number of SSPX

priests will docilely follow their official leaders into the embrace of the loving modernists in Rome, an embrace that will become over time as tight as necessary to stifle any remaining effort to fight against that deadly modernism which is killing off the official Church and putting millions of souls on the path to Hell. In retrospect one may guess that Bishop Fellay has worked skilfully with the Romans towards this embrace for at least the last 15 years. Bishop de Galarreta has seen what is at stake, but has thrown in his lot with Bishop Fellay. Bishop Tissier also sees clearly the deadly threat to the Archbishop's work, but he does not see the need to follow the Archbishop's example of putting the Faith before all normal rules of obedience and unity.

And so, dear friends, if we wish to keep the fullness of the Faith and help others to do so, we must at least internally take to the hills. Have no fear. Keep a cool head. There is no need to lose heart, or despair. God does not change, and the fight for his cause becomes more glorious than ever. Priests, keep watch, and above all do not deceive yourselves that nothing in the Society is changing. It has already essentially changed. Lay-folk, keep watch also, and pray, and God will give you the leaders and priests of your prayers. In God we trust, and in his Blessed Mother.

Kyrie eleison.

NEW ORDINATIONS – I

No. CCCLVI (356)

May 10, 2014

Should a Newchurch priest be re-ordained, or not?

Answer unsure, from gradual Newchurch rot.

Should priests ordained with the new rite of Ordination of 1972 be conditionally re-ordained with the old and certainly valid rite of Ordination? Catholic doctrine on the validity of sacraments is clear, but the sacramental rites of the Newchurch seem to have been designed to lead gradually to invalidity (see EC 121 of Oct 31, 2009). The « gradually » is the problem. How far along was that gradual process in any given case? Perhaps God alone knows for sure. But let us begin with the clear doctrine.

One can say a Catholic sacrament involves five elements: Minister, Intention, Matter and Form are essential for validity, the Rite surrounding the Form can be important for validity by its sudden or gradual bearing on the Minister's Intention. For priestly Orders, the Minister has to be a validly consecrated bishop; the Intention is his sacramental (not moral) intention, in ordaining, to do what the Church does; the Matter is his laying of both hands on the head of the man to be ordained (women cannot be validly ordained to the priesthood of Christ); the Form is the crucial formula or series of words in the rite which express the conferring of the priesthood; the Rite is all the other words surrounding that Form, and prescribed in the ceremonial rite of Ordination.

In a new rite Ordination, if both hands are laid on the head, the Matter is no problem. The new Form in Latin is, if anything, stronger for validity than the old Form in Latin (by the « et » instead of an « ut »), but vernacular translations need to be checked to make sure that they clearly express the grace of the priesthood to be conferred. Most of them surely do. Where real problems of validity arise is with the Minister and the Intention, because of the gradual erosion of Catholic Intention by the uncatholic new Rites.

For, as to the Intention, any bishop today ordaining a priest surely intends to do what today's Church does, well and good, but what is that in his mind? What is a priest in the Newchurch? Is not yesteryear's renewer of the Sacrifice of Calvary by the Real

Presence being slowly but steadily replaced by today's co-ordinator of eucharistic picnics? How far along is this process in any given diocese of the world? Did this or that bishop have in mind a sacrificer or a picnicker as being what the Church does? The ordaining bishop's outward behaviour will indicate his Intention, but God alone may know for sure. Certainly many new Rites of Mass incline towards the picnicker, and the new Rite of Ordination surrounding the Form can only help by its severely diminished catholic content to undermine gradually the sacramental Intention of an ordaining bishop.

And as to the Minister, if the ordaining bishop was himself consecrated bishop with the new rite of consecration, let us assume that the ambiguity of the new Form of consecration is lifted by the words immediately following, nevertheless doubts like those above as to the Intention of the bishop consecrating must arise: did he consider, and therefore have as his Intention, that today's Church consecrates makers of the Sacrifice, or of picnics? Such questions can often lack clear answers.

In brief, were I Pope, I think I might require that all priests or bishops ordained or consecrated with the « renewed » rites should be conditionally re-ordained or re-consecrated, not because I would believe that none of them were true priests or bishops, on the contrary, but because when it comes to the sacraments all serious doubts must be removed, and that would be the simplest way of removing all possible doubts. Newchurch rot of the sacraments could not be left hanging around.

Kyrie eleison.

CHURCH'S INFALLIBILITY – III

No. CCCLVII (357)

May 17, 2014

If four conditions are not all in play.
The Popes can err in what they teach or say.

The crazy words and deeds of Pope Francis are presently driving many believing Catholics towards sedevacantism, which is dangerous. The belief that the Conciliar Popes have not been and are not Popes may begin as an opinion, but all too often one observes that the opinion turns into a dogma and then into a mental steel trap. I think the minds of many sedevacantists shut down because the unprecedented crisis of Vatican II has caused their Catholic minds and hearts an agony which found in sedevacantism a simple solution, and they have no wish to re-open the agony by re-opening the question. So they positively crusade for others to share their simple solution, and in so doing many of them – not all – end up displaying an arrogance and a bitterness which are no signs or fruits of a true Catholic.

Now these “Comments” have abstained from proclaiming with certainty that the Conciliar Popes have been true Popes, but at the same time they have argued that the usual sedevacantist arguments are neither conclusive nor binding upon Catholics, as some sedevacantists would have us believe. Let us return to one of their most important arguments, which is from Papal infallibility: Popes are infallible. But liberals are fallible, and Conciliar Popes are liberal. Therefore they are not Popes.

To this one may object that a Pope is certainly infallible only when he engages the four conditions of the Church’s Extraordinary Magisterium by teaching 1 as Pope, 2 on Faith or morals, 3 definitively, 4 so as to bind all Catholics. Whereupon sedevacantists and liberals alike reply that it is Church teaching that the Ordinary Universal Magisterium is also infallible, so – and here is the weak point in their argument – whenever the Pope teaches solemnly even outside of his Extraordinary Magisterium, he must also be infallible. Now their liberal Conciliar teaching is solemn. Therefore we must become either liberals or sedevacantists, depending of course on who is wielding the same argument.

But the hallmark of teaching which belongs to the Church’s Ordinary Universal

Magisterium is not the solemnity with which the Pope teaches outside of the Extraordinary Magisterium, but whether what he is teaching corresponds, or not, to what Our Lord, his Apostles and virtually all their successors, the bishops of the Universal Church, have taught in all times and in all places, in other words whether it corresponds to Tradition. Now Conciliar teaching (e.g. religious liberty and ecumenism) is in rupture with Tradition. Therefore Catholics today are not in fact bound to become liberals or sedevacantists.

However, both liberals and sedevacantists cling to their misunderstanding of Papal infallibility for reasons that are not without interest, but that is another story. In any case they do not give up easily, so they come back with another objection which deserves to be answered. Both of them will say that to argue that Tradition is the hallmark of the Ordinary Magisterium is to set up a vicious circle. For if the Church's teaching authority, or Magisterium, exists to tell what is Church doctrine, as it does, then how can the Traditional doctrine at the same time tell what is the Magisterium? Either the teacher authorises what is taught, or what is taught authorises the teacher, but they cannot both at the same time authorise each other. So to argue that Tradition which is taught authorises the Ordinary Magisterium which is teaching, is wrong, and so the Pope is infallible not only in his Extraordinary teaching, and so we must become either liberals or sedevacantists, they conclude.

Why there is no vicious circle must wait until next week. It is as interesting as why both sedevacantists and liberals fall into the same error on infallibility.

Kyrie eleison.

BENEDICT'S THINKING – IV

No. CCCLVIII (358)

May 24, 2014

Tradition is of Popes the measuring-rod
Because it came at first only from God.

To Cardinal Newman is attributed a wise comment on the 1870 definition of the Pope's infallibility: "It left him as it found him." Indeed that definition will have changed nothing in the Pope's power to teach infallibly, because it belongs to the unchanging nature of God's true Church that God will protect it from error, at least when its supreme teaching authority is engaged. All such engagement is now called the Church's "Extraordinary Magisterium," but only the name can have been new in 1870, just like the name of the "Ordinary Universal Magisterium." If Vatican I declared the latter also to be infallible, it must also have been so from the beginning of the Church. To discern the realities behind the two names, let us go back to that beginning.

By the time Our Lord ascended to Heaven, he had with his divine infallibility entrusted to his Apostles a body of doctrine which they were to hand down intact to his Church to the end of the world (Mt. XXVIII, 19–20), doctrine which all souls were to believe on pain of damnation (Mk. XVI, 15–16). This Deposit of the Faith, or public Revelation, God was bound to make recognisable and accessible to souls of good will, because obviously the true God could never condemn eternally a soul for refusing to believe in an untruth. By the death of the last Apostle this Deposit was not only infallible but also complete.

Then from the Apostles onwards would God protect all churchmen from ever teaching error? By no means. Our Lord warned us to beware of "false prophets" (Mt. VII, 15), and St Paul likewise warned against "ravening wolves" (Acts, XX, 29–30). But how could God permit such a danger to his sheep from erring pastors? Because he wants for his Heaven neither robot pastors nor robot sheep, but pastors and sheep that will both have used the mind and free-will he gave them to teach or follow the Truth. And if a mass of pastors betray, he can always raise a St Athanasius or an Archbishop Lefebvre, for instance, to ensure that his infallible Truth remains always accessible to

souls.

Nevertheless that Deposit will be unceasingly exposed to ravening wolves, adding error to it or subtracting truth from it. So how will God still protect it? By guaranteeing that whenever a Pope engages all four conditions of his full teaching authority to define what does and does not belong to it, he will be divinely protected from error – what we call today the “Extraordinary Magisterium.” (Note how this Extraordinary Magisterium presupposes the infallible Ordinary Magisterium, and can add to it no truth or infallibility, but only a greater certainty for us human beings.) But if the Pope engages any less than all four conditions, then his teaching will be infallible if it corresponds to the Deposit handed down from Our Lord – today called the “Universal Ordinary Magisterium,” but fallible if it is not within that Deposit handed down, or Tradition. Outside of Tradition, his teaching may be true or false.

Thus there is no vicious circle (see EC 357 of last week) because Our Lord authorised Tradition and Tradition authorises the Magisterium. Indeed it is the function of the Pope to declare with authority what belongs to Tradition, and he will be divinely protected from error if he engages his full authority to do so, but he can make declarations outside of Tradition, in which case he will have no such protection. Now the novelties of Vatican II such as religious liberty and ecumenism are way outside of Church Tradition. So they come under neither the Pope’s Ordinary nor his Extraordinary Magisterium, and all the nonsense of all the Conciliar Popes does not oblige any Catholic to become either a liberal or a sedevacantist.

Kyrie eleison.

CHURCH INFALLIBILITY – V

No. CCCLIX (359)

May 31, 2014

The loss of objective truth in depth explains
The Church's sedevac and liberal pains.

Liberalism is war on God, and it is the dissolution of truth. Within today's Church crippled by liberalism, sedevacantism is an understandable reaction, but it still credits authority with too much power over truth. The modern world has lost natural truth, let alone supernatural truth, and here is the heart of the problem.

For our purposes we might divide all papal teaching into three parts. Firstly, if the Pope teaches as Pope, on Faith or morals, definitively and so as to bind all Catholics, then we have his Extraordinary Magisterium (EM for short), necessarily infallible. Secondly, if he does not engage all four conditions but teaches in line with what the Church has always and everywhere taught and imposed on Catholics to believe, then he is partaking in what is called the Church's "Ordinary Universal Magisterium" (OUM for short), also infallible. Thirdly we have the rest of his teaching, which, if it is out of line with Tradition, is not only fallible but also false.

By now it should be clear that the EM is to the OUM as snow-cap is to mountain. The snow-cap does not make the summit of the mountain, it merely makes it more visible. EM is to OUM as servant to master. It exists to serve the OUM by making clear once and for all what does or does not belong to the OUM. But what makes the rest of the mountain visible, so to speak, is its being traceable back to Our Lord and his Apostles, in other words, Tradition. That is why every EM definition is at pains to show that what is being defined was always previously part of Tradition. It was mountain before it was covered in snow.

By now it should also be clear that Tradition tells the Popes what to teach, and not the other way round. This is the basis on which Archbishop Lefebvre founded the Traditional movement, yet it is this same basis which, with all due respect, liberals and sedevacantists fail to grasp. Just see in the Gospel of St John how often Our Lord himself, as man, declares that what he is teaching comes not from himself but from his Father, for instance: "My doctrine is not mine but his that sent me" (VII, 16), or,

“I have not spoken from out of myself; but the Father who sent me, he gave me commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak” (XII, 49). Of course nobody on earth is more authorized than the Pope to tell Church and world what is in Tradition, but he cannot tell Church or world that there is in Tradition what is not in it. What is in it is objective, now 2,000 years old, it is above the Pope and it sets limits to what a Pope can teach, just as the Father’s commandment set limits to what Christ as man would teach.

Then how can liberals and sedevacantists alike claim, in effect, that the Pope is infallible even outside of both EM and OUM? Because both overrate authority in relation to truth, and so they see Church authority no longer as the servant but as the master of truth. And why is that? Because they are both children of the modern world where Protestantism defied the Truth and liberalism ever since the French Revolution has been dissolving objective truth. And if there is no longer any objective truth, then of course authority can say whatever it can get away with, which is what we observe all around us, and there is nothing left to stop a Paul VI or a Bishop Fellay from becoming more and more arbitrary and tyrannical in the process.

Mother of God, obtain for me to love, discern and defend that Truth and order coming from the Father, both supernatural and natural, to which your own Son was as man subject, “unto death, even to the death of the Cross.”

Kyrie eleison.

“CONCILIAR CHURCH”?

No. CCCLX (360)

June 7, 2014

The Church does parts from God and man combine.
The human can be rotted, not the divine.

The expression “Conciliar church” obviously expresses a reality, something real, namely the mass of people and institutions professing themselves to be Catholic but in fact sliding into the practice of the new humanist religion of the Second Vatican Council. “Sliding,” because Conciliarism, or neo-modernism, is precisely designed to enable Catholics to maintain the appearances of the Faith while they empty out the substance. Catholics in the concrete can make this process as fast or as slow as they wish, they need not even take it all the way to its conclusion, but Conciliarism in the abstract is utterly opposed to Catholicism and, taken to its conclusion, it destroys both Faith and Church, as it was meant to do.

The process is not difficult to observe or to understand, but liberals at the head of the Society of St Pius X, seeking reconciliation with the Conciliarists in Rome, have done their best to confuse the question of the Conciliar church and the Catholic Church. For instance the Catholic Church is visible, they will say, and the Conciliar church is the visible church, so the Conciliar church is the Catholic Church, an argument dismissed years ago by Archbishop Lefebvre as “childish” (many churches are visible that are not Catholic). Equally childish is the argument that there is only one Church, so the Conciliar church and the Catholic Church must be one and the same (there are thousands of false churches).

The truth is not too complicated. The Catholic Church is a living organism, both divine and human, like its Founder, Jesus Christ. As divine, as being his Immaculate Bride, it cannot be corrupt or corrupted, but as being made up of sinful human beings, it can partially rot just like any other living organism. So one useful way to understand how the Conciliar church relates to the Catholic Church is to think of a rotten apple.

On the one hand the rot belongs to the apple. All rot was once apple. The rot is a corruption of the apple, a parasite on the apple, it could not exist without the apple and it remains firmly attached to the apple unless and until the rotten part falls off.

Likewise Conciliarism belongs to the Catholic Church insofar as everything Conciliar was once Catholic, it is a corruption of the Catholic Church, a parasite on the Catholic Church, it could not exist without the Catholic Church, and it remains firmly attached to some part of the Catholic Church unless and until it destroys that part, as it was designed to do.

On the other hand the rot does not belong to the apple. No apple was ever meant to go rotten. All rot is a transformation of some apple, a corruption and parasite of apple, transforming it for the worse, resulting in something quite different from apple, something which nobody in his right mind would dream of eating or of saying that it was no different from apple. Likewise Conciliarism does not belong to the Catholic Church, it is a corruption of something Catholic and is a parasite on whatever is Catholic. It transforms (a human part of) the Catholic Church for the worse, resulting in something essentially non-Catholic which no Catholic in his right mind would call Catholic or want to associate with, on pain of losing his faith.

In brief, Conciliarism is rot, and the “Conciliar church” is the one divine-human Church being rotted in one or other of its human aspects. Of course the Catholic Church will last to the end of the world (Mt. XXVIII, 20), while the “Conciliar church” is merely one in a long line of parasite churches down the ages, living on what they rot and rotting what they live on. A plague on all liberals, confused and confusing!

Kyrie eleison.

BRAVE PRIESTS

No. CCCLXI (361)

June 14, 2014

When liberals destroy, how much we need
Priests clear in mind, and brave in word and deed!

As a number of you will know, Fr Fernando Altamira is a young Argentinian priest of the Society of St Pius X, working in Bogotá, the capital city of Columbia in South America, who several months ago took a clear and public stand against the betrayal of the Faith and of Archbishop Lefebvre's Society by Bishop Fellay and his team in Menzingen, Switzerland. Walking out of the Society's Priory to found an alternative parish nearby, Fr Altamira was followed by the large part of his previous parishioners. As I was able to observe in mid-April, he is a pious, intelligent and hard-working priest, popular with the people. For his pains he is being "excluded" from the SSPX.

He wrote to Bishop Fellay, protesting that his "exclusion" is invalid. He sent a copy of his well-argued protest to a veteran priest of the SSPX who understands too well how the modern world operates to be fooled by Bishop Fellay. Here are Fr Jean-Michel Faure's wise comments:—

"It is obvious that there is a problem in the Society of St Pius X. Liberals took control, and they want to be integrated into the structure of modernist Rome. And, as Fr Pfluger has said, they want to expel all anti-liberals opposed to their Operation Suicide. One more proof of the on-going Recognition of the SSPX by Rome is the churches that certain bishops of France offer to Bishop Fellay, for the Requiem Mass of Fr Lagneau, for the Jubilee Mass of Fr Marziac, on various occasions the Basilica of Lourdes, the Confirmations in Corsica, and so on.

"Secrecy is the mode of operating worthy of a liberal politician who wants to bring his electors around to a goal directly opposed to what he had promised in order to get elected. By a series of ambiguous statements skilfully graded to advance little by little, the politician brings the great majority of his followers to accept the opposite conclusion to what they were convinced of to begin with. It is Macchiavellian deceit, lying and hypocrisy, pure and simple. For this Superior General the end justifies the means, and to attain that end he does not hesitate to take positions repeatedly

condemned by Archbishop Lefebvre. What would the Archbishop say of him and his two Assistants? That they are idiots, childish, naive and disobedient, that they are making the Society commit suicide and that they are betraying the fight for the Faith. And they are going to hand over to the modernists in Rome the fruits of so much generosity and so many sacrifices made by the faithful.

“The modernists in Rome have never backed down on their demands that we accept the Second Vatican Council and the legitimacy of the New Mass. In 1975 the Rector and professors of Écône advised the Archbishop to accept the Council in order to save the Mass, and they ended up rebelling and quitting the Seminary in August of 1977. Today the three ringleaders in Menzingen go so far as to accept the legitimacy of the Lutheran Mass. As the three of them say, the Society’s reluctance to go along makes us very annoying to our “new friends in Rome,” while to wait for the conversion of Rome is unrealistic, as far as they are concerned. For sure and certain God alone can clean up this situation, totally different from the situation of the Church when it was reformed by St Pius V. Like the Captain of the Titanic, Bishop Fellay and his headquarters will bring the Society’s Operation Suicide to a successful conclusion. Blind leaders of the blind. But anyone who is not blind must resist this suicide, and keep the Faith.”

If only the Society had more priests as clear-sighted and courageous as Fr Altamira and Fr Faure!

Kyrie eleison.

DICKENS' BROADSTAIRS

No. CCCLXII (362)

June 21, 2014

For Dickens, Broadstairs was a great delight.
To find out why, come listen to Dr White.

A number of friends have asked me how I like the house newly purchased for the “Resistance” in Kent, England. I like it. It is spacious and it is being beautifully set up by a fellow-exile from the Society of St Pius X, Fr Stephen Abraham. Only Heaven knows how it intends the house to be used in the near and distant future, but it is meanwhile a delightful refuge, five minutes on foot from the sea which God created, and which the liberals cannot touch.

Several famous English artists and writers from the past have also found refuge in this delightful corner of north-east Kent. Most famous of the artists is J.M.W. TURNER (1775–1851). Born in London where he spent most of his working life, from age 11 he spent several formative years in Margate, some four miles up the coast from Broadstairs. Here he discovered the sea, which with its light effects was a lifelong inspiration for his painting, and to Margate he frequently returned later in life.

Also in Margate the most famous poet in English of the 20th century, T.S. ELIOT (1898–1965), composed in an open-air pavilion still standing on Margate’s beach, a substantial section of the third part of his most famous poem, *The Wasteland* (1922). He had come to the seaside town as a refugee from London where an unhappy marriage had seriously affected his health. He did not stay long, but went on to Lausanne, Switzerland, where thanks to the care of a good doctor he completed his recovery and *The Wasteland*. But the prospect of the sea at Margate had no doubt helped.

Another famous poet, at least in England, was a frequent visitor to Ramsgate, two miles down the coast from Broadstairs. Samuel Taylor COLERIDGE, one of England’s five outstanding Romantic poets, is best-known for his long poem, *The Ancient Mariner*. He loved bathing in the sea at Ramsgate, perhaps also for health reasons. In any case, the colder the sea, the more he liked it.

Most famous of all, however, was a frequent visitor to Broadstairs itself, the novelist Charles Dickens (1812–1870). He first resorted to Broadstairs in 1837, as a quiet place in which to complete his first novel, *The Pickwick Papers*, but he so fell in love with the antiquated little seaside town that he often returned with his family to write, or to rest from writing, through the 1840's and into the 1850's. His name and names of his novels, or of characters from his novels, are to be found all over the old town that he knew. It is now surrounded, not to say strangled, by Victorian and modern suburbs, but Broadstairs still celebrates every year its most famous visitor with a Dickens Festival in June.

Dr. David Allen White, a Catholic teacher of literature and music who is well-known to many Catholics striving to keep the Faith all over the English-speaking world, is a great lover of Dickens. Since he is passing through London this summer, he agreed to visit Broadstairs in order to hold on August 2 and 3 a 24-hour weekend seminar on Dickens, open to the public and including three conferences and Sunday Mass, and a visit which he will guide to the Dickens Museum in town, set up in a little old house known to, and visited by, Dickens himself. If you are interested in attending, let us know soon (through info@dinoscopus.org), because if numbers have to be limited, first come will be first served. Meals will be provided in-house, but visitors will have to find their own accommodation outside. Beware, it will be the height of the holiday season.

Dickens was not Catholic, but Dostoevsky called him “a great Christian.” Dickens certainly had a warm and open heart, and a brilliant pen.

Kyrie eleison.

CARDINAL PIE – I

No. CCCLXIII (363)

June 28, 2014

A Cardinal saw how far the Church must shrink
In these end times, yet never will it sink.

Cardinal Pie (1815–1880) was a great churchman of 19th century France, one of the great defenders of the Faith against that liberalism which was eating up the world from the French Revolution (1789) onwards. Pope Pius X kept his works by his bedside and read them constantly. No doubt the Cardinal's profound grasp of the key ideas driving the modern world played a major part in enabling Pius X to obtain a 50-year reprieve, say from 1907 to 1958, for the doomed Catholic Church.

Doomed? But the Catholic Church cannot be doomed! True, by God's protection it will last to the end of the world (Mt. XXVIII, 20), but at the same time by God's Word we know that by then the Faith will scarcely be found on earth (Lk. XVIII, 8), and that it will have been given to the forces of evil to defeat the Saints (Apoc. XIII, 7). These are two important quotes to bear in mind in 2014, because everything around us today tells us that the followers of Christ must be prepared for one seeming defeat after another, e.g. the fall of the Society of St Pius X. Here is what Cardinal Pie had to say on the matter, some 150 years ago:—

“Let us fight, hoping against hope itself, which is what I wish to tell faint-hearted Christians, slaves to popularity, worshippers of success and shaken by the least advance of evil. Given how they feel, please God they will be spared the agonies of the world's final trial. Is that trial close or is it still far off? Nobody knows, and I will not dare to make a guess. But one thing is certain, namely that the closer we come to the end of the world, the more and more it is wicked and deceitful men who will gain the upper hand. The Faith will hardly be found on earth, meaning that it will almost have disappeared from earthly institutions. Believers themselves will hardly dare to profess their belief in public, or in society.

“The splitting, separating and divorcing of States from God which was for St Paul a sign foretelling the end, will advance day by day. The Church, while remaining always a visible society, will be reduced more and more to dimensions of the individual and

the home. When she started out she said she was being shut in, and she called for more room to breathe, but as she approaches her end on earth, so she will have to fight a rearguard action every inch of the way, being surrounded and hemmed in on all sides. The more widely she spread out in previous ages, the greater the effort will now be made to cut her down to size. Finally the Church will undergo what looks like a veritable defeat, and the Beast will be given to make war on the Saints and to overwhelm them. The insolence of evil will be at its peak.”

These are prophetic words, coming truer by the day, not at all pleasant to admit, but anchored in Scripture. A wise Anglican Bishop (Butler) said in the 18th century, “Things are what they are. Their consequences will be what they will be. Why then should we seek to deceive ourselves?” Notice especially how the Cardinal foresees the impossibility of defending the Faith on any larger scale than just the home. Not everybody agrees that we have already reached that point in 2014. I might wish they were right, but I have yet to be persuaded that with disintegrated people one can make an integrated society. Contrast with us democratic citizens of today the Roman centurion in the Gospel who understood a chain of command and recognized naturally the authority of Our Lord (Mt. VIII, 5–18) – how Our Lord praised him!

Patience. See next week how the Cardinal himself reacted to what he foresaw. He was no defeatist!

Kyrie eleison.

CARDINAL PIE

No. CCCLXIV (364)

July 5, 2014

The Cardinal lost no hope from an evil world.
With faith he saw the triumph of Heaven unfurled.

The quote last week from Cardinal Pie (cf. EC 362) continued directly as follows:—

“In such an extremity, in such a desperate state of affairs, where evil has taken over a world soon to be consumed in flames, what are all the true Christians to do, all good men, all Saints, all men with any faith and courage? Grappling with a situation more clearly impossible than ever, with a redoubled energy by their ardent prayer, by their active works and by their fearless struggles they will say, O God, O Father in Heaven, hallowed be thy name on earth as it is in Heaven, thy kingdom come on earth as it is in Heaven, thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven. On earth as it is in Heaven! And they will still be murmuring these words while the very earth is giving way beneath their feet.

“And just as once upon a time, following upon an appalling military disaster the whole Roman Senate and State officials of all ranks could be seen going out to meet the defeated consul and to congratulate him on not having despaired of the Roman Republic; so likewise the senate of Heaven, all the Choirs of angels, all ranks of the Blessed will come out to meet the generous athletes of the Faith who will have fought to the bitter end, hoping against hope itself.

“And then that impossible ideal that the elect of all ages had obstinately pursued will become a reality. In his Second and final Coming the Son will hand over the Kingdom of this world to God his Father, the power of evil will have been cast out for ever into the depths of the abyss; whatever has refused to be assimilated and incorporated into God through Jesus Christ by faith, love and observance of the law will be flung into the sewer of everlasting filth. And God will live and reign for ever and ever, not only in the oneness of his nature and in the society of the three divine Persons, but also in the fullness of the Mystical Body of his Incarnate Son and in the fulfilment of the Communion of Saints!”

Dear readers, it should be obvious by now that Cardinal Pie, for all the darkness of his vision of the future, was no defeatist. Even while seeing with an absolute clarity the humanly hopeless situation into which mankind was getting itself, with an equal clarity he distinguished the human from the divine point of view: a mass of men might in the 19th century have been defying Almighty God and turning themselves into pawns of Satan and fodder for his horrible Hell, nevertheless God's sublime purpose for the souls of the elect who would choose to love and serve him was at the same time being achieved for God's Heaven. Truly, "to them that love God, all things work together unto good" (Rom. VIII, 28).

In 2014 we can easily lose sight of God's purpose by thinking in too human a way of the evil advancing all around us. But God's purpose is not to save civilisation if men wish to destroy it. His purpose is to bring souls to Heaven through his Son Jesus Christ, and for this purpose the collapse of civilisation and of all earthly ambitions and hopes may well serve to force men's minds and hearts to rise above worldly considerations. God did not create us only for this short life, nor for this corrupt world. "We have not here a lasting city, but we seek one that is to come" (Heb. XIII, 14).

Kyrie eleison.

AGREEMENT HERE

No. CCCLXV (365)

July 12, 2014

With Rome, Society contacts quietly flow.
All enmity will soon be long ago.

On December 13 of last year, in St Martha's House in Rome where the Pope is currently living, the Pope met briefly with Bishop Fellay, Superior General of the Society of St Pius X. The Society officially denies that the meeting had any significance, but an Italian commentator having some familiarity with how Rome operates, one Giacomo Devoto (G.D.), argues that the meeting was proof that a Rome-SSPX agreement has been reached. See http://www.unavox.it/ArtDiversi/DIV812_Devoto_Notizia_intrigante.html. In brief:—

On the morning of the 13th Bishop Fellay and his two Assistants at the head of the SSPX met in the Vatican with the heads of the Ecclesia Dei Commission at the invitation of Monsignor Guido Pozzo, restored to the Commission by Pope Francis to deal with the problematic relations between Rome and the SSPX. An official publication of the SSPX, DICI, claims that this meeting was merely “informal,” but G.D. says that even being informal it cannot have taken place without there having been beforehand a series of discreet contacts to repair the public breach of relations in June of 2012. Also, says G.D., such a meeting is the necessary preliminary to any “formal” meeting.

In any case after that meeting Msgr. Pozzo, Msgr. di Noia and the three heads of the SSPX repaired to St Martha's House where the Pope also happened to be lunching. When the Pope stood up after the meal to leave, Bishop Fellay went over to him, they exchanged a few words in public view and the Bishop kissed the Pope's ring (or knelt down for his blessing, according to Rome's Vatican Insider). DICI again minimised the encounter as nothing more than a chance meeting with a spontaneous exchange of courtesies. On the contrary G.D. reasonably maintains that even such a “chance” encounter cannot have taken place without the Pope's previous knowledge and approval.

Moreover, says G.D., in the art of diplomacy such a meeting is a finely calculated ice-breaker, of elastic interpretation, designed to mean as much or as little as one wants. On the one hand the courteous contact was there for all to see in a public place frequented by important Newchurch officials, and it could be seen as papal support of whatever had gone on at the morning's meeting with the Commission. On the other hand both Rome and the SSPX could plausibly deny that the encounter had any real significance beyond an exchange of courtesies.

Thus when rumours began to circulate in the new year, for months the SSPX denied that there was any question of a Rome-SSPX agreement. Only on May 10 did DICI admit that there had been any contact at all between the Pope and Bishop Fellay, and then DICI so minimised the event that G.D. takes it as a sure sign that an agreement has been reached in private. (In modern politics, as the cynical saying goes, nothing can be taken as true until it is officially denied.)

In fact the main problem, for Pope Francis as for Bishop Fellay, is not how to come to an agreement which they both want, but how to get their left and right wings respectively to accept an agreement. However, the problem is being solved for them day by day as the Society, once glorious for its defence of the Faith, becomes the inglorious Newsociety. For indeed how many Newchurch bishops can still be fearing the Newsociety as a threat to their Newchurch? And how many SSPX priests are still convinced that any agreement with Rome would be a disaster, especially if they are promised that "they will need to change nothing"? Such an agreement will hardly need to be announced. In many minds and hearts it is already here.

Kyrie eleison.

TRADITION

No. CCCLXVI (366)

July 19, 2014

If Catholic churchmen gravely err, we may
Declare, if we are right, how far they stray.

The word “Magisterium,” coming from the Latin for “master” (“magister”), means in the Church either the Church’s authoritative teaching or its authorised teachers. Now as teacher is superior to taught, so the Magisterium teaching is superior to the Catholic people being taught. But the Catholic Masters have free-will, and God leaves them free to err. Then if they err gravely, may the people stand up to them and tell them, however respectfully, that they are wrong? The question is answered by truth. It is only when most people have lost the truth, as today, that the question can become confused.

On the one hand it is certain that Our Lord endowed his Church with a teaching authority, to teach us fallible human beings that Truth which alone can get us to Heaven – “Peter, confirm thy brethren.” On the other hand Peter was only to confirm them in that faith which Our Lord had taught him – “I have prayed that thy faith fail not, and thou being converted, confirm thy brethren” (Lk. XXII, 32). In other words that faith governs Peter which it is his function only to guard and expound faithfully, such as it was deposited with him, the Deposit of Faith, to be handed down for ever as Tradition. Tradition teaches Peter, who teaches the people.

Vatican I (1870) says the same thing. Catholics must believe “all truths contained in the word of God or handed down by Tradition” and which the Church puts forward as divinely revealed, by its Extraordinary or Ordinary Universal Magisterium (one recalls that without Tradition in its broadest sense, there would have been no “word of God,” or Bible). Vatican I says moreover that this Magisterium is gifted with the Church’s infallibility, but this infallibility excludes any novelty being taught. Then Tradition in its broadest sense governs what the Magisterium can say it is, and while the Magisterium has authority to teach inside Tradition, it has no authority to teach the people anything outside of Tradition.

Yet souls do need a living Magisterium to teach them the truths of salvation inside Catholic Tradition. These truths do not change any more than God or his Church change, but the circumstances of the world in which the Church has to operate are changing all the time, and so according to the variety of these circumstances the Church needs living Masters to vary all the time the presentation and explanation of the unvarying truths. Therefore no Catholic in his right mind disputes the need for the Church's living Masters.

But what if these Masters claim that something is inside Tradition which is not there? On the one hand they are learned men, authorised by the Church to teach the people, and the people are relatively ignorant. On the other hand there is for instance the famous case of the Council of Ephesus (428), where the people rose up in Constantinople to defend the divine Motherhood of the Blessed Virgin Mary against the heretical Patriarch Nestor.

The answer is that objective truth is above Masters and people alike, so that if the people have the truth on their side, they are superior to their Masters if the Masters do not have the truth. On the other hand if the people do not have the truth, they have no right to rise up against the Masters. In brief, if they are right, they have the right. If they are not right, they have no right. And what tells if they are right or not? Neither Masters (necessarily), nor people (still less necessarily), but reality, even if Masters or people, or both, conspire to smother it.

Kyrie eleison.

FRANCE STIRS

No. CCCLXVII (367)

July 26, 2014

Priests met in France, and met with good success,
To relieve, we pray, some of the Faith's distress.

Many of you know that on Tuesday and Wednesday of last week was held in the Dominican Friary of Avrillé close to Angers in North-west France a meeting of resistant priests from wherever the "Resistance" is up and running, but mainly from France. This was the third such meeting of French priests held in Avrillé since the beginning of the year, and it was the most important. This time they began to co-ordinate and to organize their activities in France, a country often decisive for the Church in various ways.

The credit for calling these meetings goes to the Prior of Avrillé, Fr Pierre-Marie. For several years Avrillé has been offering support and a refuge to priests of the Society of St Pius X who have been finding their priestly life more and more difficult under its present leadership, whose pursuit of reconciliation with the Newchurch in Rome is, despite the disguise and denials, relentless. Only a few weeks ago the Society's Second Assistant is reported to have said, "The train is leaving for Rome, and those who want to get off will get off." For as long as possible Fr Pierre-Marie sought not to break off relations with the official SSPX, but earlier this year came the letter from Bishop Fellay finalising the rupture. That was inevitable, unless Avrillé would also betray Tradition.

Originally Fr Pierre-Marie designed last week's meeting for the French priests, but I suggested to him that resistant priests from outside France might also be invited for a double reason: the priests from outside would be encouraged to see the "Resistance" stirring in France, where it has stirred little – outwardly – up till now, and the French priests in turn might be reminded that there is not only France. Fr Pierre-Marie accepted my suggestion, and that is how it turned out, some 18 priests in all.

The meeting went very well. There was little looking back and no bitterness, much looking forward. The first day's business was largely for the French priests. They began by nominating as their co-ordinator Fr. de Mérode, a priest from Belgium with

30 years' experience in the SSPX, all over the world. Then for their organisation being born they chose the name of "Priestly Union of Marcel Lefebvre," a name that announces clearly the orientation. And finally Fr. De Mérode began organising a network of Mass centres all over France – back to the 1970's, but in harsher conditions, and with very limited resources, at least for the moment.

The second day's business was given over to international concerns for the defence of the Faith, and here of course arose the question of episcopal consecrations, because I for one wished to know the mind of the priests present. It was relatively unanimous. Readers will be encouraged to know that while the priests thought that the time for consecrations had not yet come, nevertheless it could not be too far off. For indeed as of now it is very difficult to imagine any of the three bishops who remain within the SSPX undertaking to consecrate anybody without the approval of Rome, and it is impossible to imagine neo-modernist Rome approving of any anti-modernist candidate! Patience.

Do pray, both for the quiet success of the budding Priestly Union, and for God to give us, in his good time, the additional bishops needed for the defence of the Faith.

Kyrie eleison.

AVENGING GOD?

No. CCCLXVIII (368)

August 2, 2014

Did God command the slaughter in Gaza today?

No! God is merciful and just. No way!

The latest horrible onslaught let loose against the virtually defenceless Palestinians in Gaza can raise in many people's minds an obstacle to the true worship of the true God, because it is well known that many of today's Israelis claim that they have from the Old Testament a God-given right to take all the land occupied by the Palestinians, by force if necessary. A reasonable person might ask two questions: what kind of a God can even remotely be pulled in to 'justify' such barbarous cruelty, together with such utter contempt for any world opinion condemning that barbarity? And what kind of a 'Chosen People' are these? The answer to both questions turns around Our Lord Jesus Christ, around whom of course all human history turns.

The Old Testament tells the story of mankind before Christ, especially the story of the Israelites, the people that God chose out from the rest of the human race to act as the cradle for the coming down from Heaven of the Incarnate God, Jesus Christ. About a thousand years after Adam, mankind had grown so corrupt that God had to wash it out and start again with the eight souls saved on Noah's Ark. About another thousand years later, mankind is again so corrupt that God has to pull Abraham out of the degenerate city Ur to be the founder of a race that must stay clear of all surrounding human contamination in order to be clean enough to act as that cradle. Here is the origin of that racial exclusivity observable in Jews ever since. It began with God, but it has fallen into the hands of men.

The Jews were indeed once, for the sake of Jesus Christ, the Chosen People. Thus St Thomas Aquinas has a tremendous article in his Summa Theologiae where he shows how every single detail in the furnishing of the Israelites' exclusive Temple in Jerusalem pointed forward to Jesus Christ (Ia IIae, 102, 4). However, to clear the Promised Land for the Israelites to take over, there is no question that Almighty God gave them more than once the command to exterminate utterly the pagans occupying the land, and He punished King Saul severely for not observing this command to the

letter (I Sam XV). What could justify such a command?

It is the same as what explains God's exterminating all mankind (except eight souls) in Noah's time. Firstly men's sins. God creates men for Heaven, they choose sin that deserves Hell. For indeed sin offends God first of all. So the sense of God and the sense of sin get lost together, as all around us today. A godless generation like ours cannot possibly understand the justice of God. Secondly, God's mercy, which goes hand in hand with His justice, and is today equally misunderstood. But given the reality of Hell, is it not a mercy of God if he cuts men off so that they can repent before they die, or at least be stopped from sinning so as not to deserve to go any deeper in Hell?

That is how it will have been with the pagan enemies of the Israelites between Abraham and Jesus Christ. To read the Old Testament is to see how often the Israelites were tempted to abandon the true God and to worship devils by the pagans all around them. As the Curé of Ars once said, 'Get rid of the priest, and within 25 years men will be worshipping beasts.' It is to the eternal credit of the Israelites that they did succeed in providing the cradle for the Messiah, for instance St Joachim and St Anne, especially their child, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the twelve Apostles and all other good Israelites who helped to launch their Messiah's Catholic Church. For today's Israelis see next week.

Kyrie eleison.

ISRAELITES, ISRAELIS?

No. CCCLXIX (369)

August 9, 2014

How did God's Chosen ones become his foes?
Pride ever in human beings blindness sows.

Let us then grant (EC 368) that the orders of Almighty God to exterminate certain peoples in the Old Testament (e.g. I Sam. XV) were an act of justice and mercy towards the pagans themselves, and an act also designed to help the Israelites forward towards cradling the Incarnate God, Our Lord Jesus Christ, when he would come many centuries later. This cradle the Israelites did provide, especially through the Blessed Virgin Mary, to whom the entire human race owes a boundless debt of gratitude. If any of us does get to Heaven, it will be only through her intercession.

Then what connection can there be between those Jews through whom salvation comes (Jn. IV, 22) and the mass of Jews today, who are either massacring Palestine or supporting the massacre, morally or financially? The majority of today's Jews being Ashkenazy Jews, they may well be no blood-descendants of Abraham, but be that as it may, they have certainly absorbed through the Talmud, the holy book of post-Christian Judaism, what Our Lord called "the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees" (Mt. XVI, 11), meaning the spirit of his bitter enemies who crucified him and have fought his Church ever since. How can his Chosen People have turned into some of his consistently worst enemies? (If the mere question seems "anti-semitic," let it be recalled that truth is good while "anti-semitism" is bad, so nothing true can be "anti-semitic" and nothing "anti-semitic" can be true. What follows is the truth, and has nothing whatsoever to do with so-called "anti-semitism").

Firstly, if the Chosen People turned against their God, the problem may seem chronological but it is not. Throughout the Old Testament there were Israelites who turned against God, for instance the worshippers of the Golden Calf or the Jews exiled to Babylon. God frequently had to punish his own "stiff-necked" and rebellious people. Likewise from the beginning of the New Testament down to our own day there have always been outstanding Jewish converts, like St Paul, who was as Jewish as could be (cf. Rom. IX, 1–5; II Cor. XI, 21–22; Phil. III, 4–6). The difference between

Israelites and Israelis is the same difference as there has always been between those of any race who love God and those who rebel against him. The true “Judeo-Christian” line stretches from Abel through, for instance, Abraham, Moses, David and the Mother of God to the Catholic Church. The false “Judeo-Christian” but true “Judeo-Masonic” line stretches from the accursed Cain through, for instance, the killers of God’s prophets to Anas and Caiphas to modern Freemasonry, which was created by Jews and is still controlled by them for purposes of fighting the Catholic Church, even if many Masons are ignorant of the fact.

Well and good, but is not the contrast between Israelites and Israelis especially sharp? Yes, because as the old saying goes, “The higher they are, the harder they fall.” Once the Chosen People refused to be the special servants of God, as they have largely done from the Incarnation onwards, they were bound to become the special servants of the Devil. For them there could be nothing in between. And what was behind that refusal? In one word, pride. Instead of using God’s special gifts to them for his glory, they bent them to their own glory. Before their Messiah came, they misconceived him as their material instead of spiritual saviour, so that when he came they refused to recognize him, and from then on they fought him for having replaced their racially exclusive Mosaic religion with the racially all-inclusive Catholic religion, open to all races.

And what can Catholics do to resist the overwhelming material dominance of the once Chosen Ones all around us? Materially, next to nothing, but a single soul praying spiritually and sincerely for God’s kingdom to come and for his will to be done can prevail on God to move material mountains, child’s play for God. He only allows that dominance in order to drive us back to him.

Kyrie Eleison.

DICKENS CONFERENCE

No. CCCLXX (370)

August 16, 2014

The modern world was hatching long ago,
We learned, as three of Dickens' novels show.

The Dickens Conference held two weeks ago at Queen of Martyrs House in Broadstairs, England, went very well, within its modest limits. On the Saturday there was only a little rain, the Sunday was all sunshine, and nearly 30 participants, mostly from England but also from Denmark, France and the USA, much enjoyed the house, one another's Catholic company, and the three lectures of Dr David White on three novels of Charles Dickens (1812–1870), England's best loved writer after William Shakespeare.

"Within its modest limits" because outside of the devoutly attended Masses on the Saturday and Sunday, there was little outwardly supernatural about the Conference. Let us say that it was a session of sanity rather than sanctity, but we notice immediately that at least in English the word "sanity" makes up three quarters of the word "sanctity." Grace builds on nature, and it can hardly build on the insanity and corruption of nature to which the world around us is giving itself over, day by day. Sanity is therefore more important than ever, even for supernatural purposes. If the "Resistance" is presently making so little apparent headway, is it not because there is just not enough sanity still around to recognize and cast out the mind-rot, and the rot of true obedience and sanctity?

In Dr White's first lecture he spoke of David Copperfield, Dickens' own favourite amongst his many novels, and specially linked to Broadstairs. This is because on Dickens' many visits for work or holidays to his beloved seaside town, he came to know an eccentric old lady who lived in a small house still existing on the sea-front. She so impressed him that he built her into David Copperfield as Betsy Trotwood, an eccentric old lady who takes in the orphaned hero of the novel and protects him until he finds his way in life. In her mouth Dickens puts his own hatred of Puritanism and Calvinism, said Dr White. At least once in his life Dickens was told that Catholicism is the one true religion, but he never became a Catholic. However, he had a supreme

respect for the Gospel of Christ, and genuinely good-hearted characters tumble over one another in the pages of his novels.

On Saturday afternoon there followed a visit to the sea-front house of “Betsy Trotwood,” now a Dickens Museum; full of Dickensian memorabilia and with a Dickensian curator. Then the second conference was on *Bleak House*, first novel of Dickens’ second period, when England was growing darker. *Bleak House* attacks lawyers and the law in particular, but in general, said Dr White, it attacks a System more and more in control of society, demoralizing and crushing the innocent sheep. Politics are becoming meaningless and the aristocracy is losing touch with reality, but an inhuman System is driving forward until it will finally collapse under its fakelikehood, in the manner of Vatican II, added Dr White.

The third lecture presented on Sunday morning *Hard Times*, another of the darker novels, about the total lack of real education, 150 years ago! Without education of the heart, Dickens knew that human beings will be cold and inhuman. Dr White drew on his decades of teaching in the USA Naval Academy to back up Dickens’ portrait of the enormous stupidity of the social robots engineered by an “education” spurning history, the arts, music, literature and especially poetry. The result, he said, is the boundless boredom of youngsters today, a reflection of pure nihilism.

However, Conference participants went home feeling neither bored nor nihilistic, but much refreshed. Deo Gratias.

Kyrie eleison.

“RESISTANCE” FAILING?

No. CCCLXXI (371)

August 23, 2014

All know what stand is taken by the “Resistance.”

Therefore it witnesses by its mere existence.

MOSES EXPLAINS

No. CCCLXXII (372)

August 30, 2014

Moses told Jews, “Serve God, for better or worse.”
Events in Gaza point to his ancient curse.

If any Catholic seeks an in-depth explanation of the on-going madness in Gaza, he should read Moses in the Old Testament. For instance, if the Israelites do not keep the commandments of God, they will be stricken with “madness and blindness and fury of mind” (Deut. XXVIII, 28), among many other curses. As Fr Meinvielle said, the Jews are a theological race, and they cannot escape their theological destiny – they are bound to God like no other people on earth.

In Deuteronomy Moses is giving to the Israelites their last solemn instructions before they enter the Promised Land, and before he dies. In Chapter 28 (paralleled by Levit. XXVI) Moses makes very clear the mind of Jehovah (or Yahweh), the God of the Old Testament, identical with the God of the New Testament: the Jews will be specially blessed (v.1–14) if they obey the one true God, they will be specially cursed (v. 15–68) if they disobey him. Either way, they are a special race being given a special knowledge of the one true God for a special mission that they must fulfil for him, with a special reward or punishment from him, depending on how they fulfil that mission.

No wonder Jews think they are special! Among the blessings listed here by Moses, God will raise them “higher than all nations” (v.1); “to be a holy people unto himself” (v.9); to be “the head and not the tail” (v.13). But in every one of these three verses it is noteworthy how Moses makes the Israelites’ superiority depend on their obedience to God: if they will “hear the voice of God and keep all his commandments” (v.1); if they “hear his commandments and walk in his ways” (v.9); if they will “hear the commandments of God and keep and do them” (v.13).

On the other hand if the Israelites try to be that superior nation on their own terms, disobeying God (v.15), then a multitude of curses will come upon them (v.16–68), and they will be scorned, hated and trampled upon by all other nations: they will be “scattered throughout all the kingdoms of the earth” (v.25); they will be stricken with “madness and blindness and fury of mind” (v.28 – think of Gaza!); the stranger with

whom they live will “rise up over” them, he will be the head and they will be the tail (v.43–44); their enemy will put an “iron yoke” upon their neck (v.48); the Lord God will afflict them with all kinds of sufferings (v.59–61), and they will be “taken away from the land which they will go in to possess” (v.63). And all of this they will suffer because of not keeping and fulfilling the words of God’s law (v.58).

Alas, did all these blessings and curses announced by the great Moses avail to make the Israelites recognize and serve their Messiah and Incarnate God when he came, as also prophesied by Moses (Deut. XVIII, 15–18)? No, they crucified him instead, which has for now nearly 2000 years brought down on their heads all of Moses’ curses. They made themselves into the most despised and downtrodden nation on earth, and they lost their right to the Promised Land, being driven out and scattered everywhere else from the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D.

Nor does their regaining possession of the Holy Land mean that the curse is being lifted, because they are doing it on their own terms and not on God’s, so that the very re-possession turns into part of the curse. As Plato said (Georgias), it is better to suffer than to commit an injustice, and therefore in spiritual reality, the Israelis are more to be pitied than the Palestinians. Patience. We “all have sinned and do need the glory of God” (Rom. III, 22–23).

Kyrie eleison.

DONOSO CORTÉS – I

No. CCCLXXIII (373)

September 6, 2014

A Spaniard saw original sin unfurled
In the foundations of our modern world.

One of the most important Catholic dogmas is that of original sin, whereby all human beings (except Our Lord and his Mother) have a nature seriously wounded from birth through our mysterious solidarity with Adam, father of all mankind, when with Eve he fell into the first of all human sins in the garden of Eden. Of course for most people today that Fall is just a fairy-tale, or mythology, and that is why they have built a Disneyworld all around us. In principle Catholics believe in original sin, but so seductive is Disneyworld that many hardly take original sin seriously in practice. After all, it's not at all nit-picky to believe we are all thinner. We are all twinning in love, love, love, aren't we!

But a man who saw very clearly original sin in action was the Spanish nobleman, writer and diplomat, Donoso Cortés (1808–1853). His life spanned that first half of the 19th century when in the wake of the French Revolution (1789), Europe was slowly but steadily replacing the old Christian order (“ancien régime”) with the Judeo-masonic New World Order. Outwardly the old order was put back in place by the Congress of Vienna (1815), but inwardly it was not at all the same as before, because men's minds were now resting on quite different foundations, liberal foundations, notably the separation of Church and State. When Donoso entered Spanish politics at a young age, he proclaimed himself to be a liberal, but as he observed the Revolutionary ideas working out in practice, he became more and more conservative until in 1847 he converted to Spain's ancient Catholic religion. From then on until his early death his written and spoken words carried all over Europe his prophetic Catholic analysis of the radical modern errors forging the New World Order.

At the back of all these errors he discerned two: the denial of God's supernatural care for his creatures, and the denial of original sin. From Donoso's Letter to Cardinal Fornari (1852) come the following two paragraphs which connect to original sin the

rise of democracy and the diminution of the Church (the translation here is from a French translation):—

“If the light of men’s reason is in no way darkened, its light is enough, without need of the Faith, to discover the truth. If the Faith is not needed, then man’s reason is sovereign and independent. The progress of truth then depends on the progress of reason, which depends upon the exercise of reason; such an exercise is to be found in discussion; hence discussion constitutes the true basic law of modern societies, the matchless crucible in which by a process of melting, truths are separated from errors. From this principle of discussion flow freedom of the press, the inviolability of freedom of speech and the real sovereignty of parliaments.”

Donoso continues with a parallel diagnosis of the consequences of man’s will being supposed to be free from original sin: “If man’s will is not sick, then he needs none of the supernatural help of grace to pursue good, its attraction being enough: if he needs no grace, then he can do without prayer and the sacraments which provide it.” If prayer is not needed, it is useless, and so are contemplation and the contemplative religious Orders, which duly disappear. If man needs no sacraments, then he has no need of priests to administer them, and they are duly banned. And scorn of the priesthood results everywhere in scorn of the Church, which amounts in all places to the scorn of God.

From such false principles Donoso Cortés foresaw an unparalleled disaster in the very near future. Actually it has been delayed for over 150 years, but how much longer?

Kyrie eleison.

POPE FALLIBLE

No. CCCLXXIV (374)

September 13, 2014

Infallibility is only lent to the Pope
From God through Church – else, he can be a “dope.”

Neither liberals nor sedevacantists appreciate being told that they are like heads and tails of the same coin, but it is true. For instance, neither of them can conceive of a third alternative. See for instance in his Letter to Three Bishops of April 14, 2012, how Bishop Fellay could see no alternative to his liberalism except sedevacantism. Conversely, for many a sedevacantist if one accepts that any of the Conciliar Popes has really been Pope, then one can only be a liberal, and if one criticises sedevacantism, then one is promoting liberalism. But not at all!

Why not? Because both of them are making the same error of exaggerating the Pope's infallibility. Why? Might it be because both of them are modern men who believe more in persons than in institutions? And why should that be a feature of modern men? Because from more or less Protestantism onwards, fewer and fewer institutions have truly sought the common good, while more and more seek some private interest such as money (my claim on you), which of course diminishes our respect for them. For instance, good men saved for a while the rotten institution of modern banking from having immediately all its evil effects, but the rotten bankers are at last showing what the institutions of fractional reserve banking and central banks were, in themselves, from the beginning. The Devil is in modern structures, thanks to the enemies of God and man.

So it is understandable if modern Catholics have tended to put too much faith in the Pope and too little in the Church, and here is the answer to that reader who asked me why I do not write about infallibility in the same way that the classic Catholic theology manuals do. Those manuals are marvellous in their way, but they were all written before Vatican II, and they tended to attach to the Pope an infallibility which belongs to the Church. For instance, the summit of infallibility is liable to be presented in the manuals as a solemn definition by the Pope, or by Pope with Council, but in any case by the Pope. The liberal-sedevacantist dilemma has been the

consequence and, as it were, a punishment of this tendency to overrate the person and underrate the institution, because the Church is no merely human institution.

For, firstly, the Solemn Magisterium's snow-cap on the Ordinary Magisterium's mountain is its summit only in a very limited way – it is completely supported by the rock summit beneath the snow. And secondly, by the Church's most authoritative text on infallibility, the Definition of the truly Catholic Council of Vatican I (1870), we know that the Pope's infallibility comes from the Church, and not the other way round. When the Pope engages all four conditions necessary for ex cathedra teaching, then, says the Definition, he possesses "that infallibility which the divine Redeemer willed his Church to enjoy in defining doctrine." But of course! Where else can infallibility come from, except from God? The best of human beings, and some Popes have been very good human beings, may be inerrant, i.e. make no mistakes, but as long as they have original sin they cannot be infallible as God alone can be. If they are infallible, the infallibility must come through, but from outside, their humanity, from God, who chooses to bestow it through the Catholic Church, and that infallibility need only be a momentary gift, for the duration of the Definition.

Therefore outside of a Pope's ex cathedra moments, nothing stops him from talking nonsense such as the new religion of Vatican II. Therefore neither liberals nor sedevacantists need or should heed that nonsense, because, as Archbishop Lefebvre said, they have 2000 years' worth of Ordinarily infallible Church teaching by which to judge that it is nonsense.

Kyrie eleison.

CONTEXT UPENDED

No. CCCLXXV (375)

September 20, 2014

In changing times unchanging truths must find
New applications, not to be left behind.

Starting out from arguments against sedevacantism as being a short-sighted error in a wholly abnormal situation, an Italian friend (C.C.) takes a longer view of that situation. Without being a priest or theologian, he ventures the opinion that sedevacantism is merely one of several attempts in the Church to fit the crisis of today into the categories of yesterday. There is no question of Catholic theology changing, but the real situation to which that theology has to be applied underwent a sea-change with Vatican II. Here is a key paragraph of his on that upended reality:—

“By its refusal of the objective reality of God’s existence and of the need to submit to his Law, today’s world is not normal, and the present Catholic unity is not normal either which has put man instead of God at the centre of things. Nor is it by a sudden swerve that the Church has arrived at this abnormal state of things, but following on a long and complex process of moving away from God, the disruptive effects of which showed up at Vatican II. For hundreds of years the germs of dissolution have been fostered within the Church, as have the men harbouring these germs, and they have been allowed to occupy all ranks of the hierarchy, up to and including the See of Peter.”

My friend goes on that if one fails to take into consideration this overall abnormality of the present state of the Church, which is unbelievably, yet truly, worse than ever, one runs the risk of dealing with a reality that no longer exists, in terms of reference that no longer apply. Thus for example the sedevacantists will say that today’s churchmen must know what they are doing, because they are intelligent and educated men. Not so, says C.C.: their preaching and practice may well no longer be Catholic, but they are convinced that they are wholly orthodox. The whole world has gone mad. They have merely gone mad with it, not by a loss of reason but by having given up the use of it, and as their Catholic faith grows weaker, so there is less and less to stop them from losing it altogether.

But then, one might object, God must have abandoned his Church. To reply, CC resorts to three quotations from Scripture. Firstly, Lk.XVIII, 8, where Our Lord wonders if he will even find the Faith on earth when he comes back. Obviously a small remainder of priests and laity (with perhaps some bishops) will be enough to ensure the indefectibility of the Church until the end of the world (one thinks of the present difficulties of the “Resistance” in taking shape). Likewise, secondly, Mt.XXIV, 11–14, where it is foreseen that many false prophets will deceive many souls, and charity will grow cold. And thirdly, Lk.XXII, 31–32, where Our Lord instructs Peter to confirm his brethren in the faith after he has converted, strongly suggesting that his faith will first have failed. So almost the whole hierarchy can fail, including Peter, without the Church ceasing to be indefectible, somewhat like when the Apostles all ran away in the Garden of Gethsemane (Mt.XXVI, 56).

In conclusion, CC’s vision for the Church of tomorrow or the day after strongly resembles that of Fr Calmel: let each of us do his duty according to his state of life, and take part in building a network of little forts of the Faith, each with a priest to ensure the sacraments, but with no henceforth inapplicable theology of the Church, nor unobtainable canonical approval, nor with any out-dated dividing-walls over the top of which the Faith will have flowed. The forts will be united by the Truth and will have mutual contacts of charity. The rest is in God’s hands.

Kyrie eleison.

CHASTISEMENT COMING

No. CCCLXXVI (376)

September 27, 2014

A frightful punishment from God is closing in.
Let us live in his grace, and not in sin.

Father Constant Louis Marie PEL (1876–1966) is not a name well-known among the souls gifted by God with a knowledge of how God is going to set today's world straight, but for those who knew him he was a priest very close to God. Doctor in theology, seminary professor, founder of a convent for women and of a seminary for men, with a great devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus and to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, he was a personal friend of Padre Pio who said of him to some French pilgrims in San Giovanni Rotondo, "Why do you come to see me when you have so great a Saint in France?"

Fr Pel would spend nights on his feet in church with his forehead leaning against the Tabernacle, conversing with God in a permanent ecstasy. He died in a car accident just after Vatican II, but not before a seminarian, one of his spiritual sons, had been able to note down a prophecy of his, dating from 1945, concerning the chastisement which will strike France in particular. Here it is, quoted or abbreviated:—

"My son," said Fr Pel, "know that with the sins of the world increasing in horror as this age wears on, great punishments from God will come down on the world and no continent will be spared by the Wrath of God. France being guilty of apostasy and denying its vocation will be severely chastised. East of a line stretching from Bordeaux in the south-west to Lille in the north-east, everything will be laid waste and set on fire by peoples invading from the east, and also by great flaming meteorites falling in a rain of fire upon all the earth and upon these regions especially. Revolution, war, epidemics, plagues, chemical poison gases, violent earthquakes and the re-awakening of France's extinct volcanoes will destroy everything . .

"France to the west of that line will be less affected . . . because of the faith rooted in the Vendée and in Brittany . . . but any of God's worst enemies seeking refuge there from the worldwide cataclysm will be found out, wherever they hide, and put to death by devils, because the Wrath of the Lord is just and holy. Thick darkness caused by

the war, gigantic fires and fragments of burning stars falling for three days and nights will cause the sun to disappear, and only candles blessed on Candlemas (February 2) will give light in the hands of believers, but the godless will not see this miraculous light because they have darkness in their souls.

“In this way, my son, three quarters of mankind will be destroyed, and in certain parts of France survivors will have to go 60 miles to find another live human being Several nations will disappear off the face of the map A France thus purified will become the renewed “Eldest Daughter of the Church,” because all the Cains and Judases will have disappeared in this ‘Judgment upon the Nations’”. This Judgment is not yet the end of times, but so great is the punishment due to the sins of the nations that Our Lord told Fr Pel that the desolation at world’s end will be lesser.

Dear readers, what do we conclude? Let each of us strive with might and main, and with the help of the Catholic sacraments given to us by God for that purpose, to live in God’s grace and not in the state of sin, and let us make full use of the time he gives us between now and the Hour of his Justice to pray for the largest possible number of sinners to repent and save their souls for eternity when the Chastisement closes in. God, have mercy. Mary, help.

Kyrie eleison.

ARCHBISHOP'S SENSE – I

No. CCCLXXVII (377)

October 4, 2014

Archbishop Lefebvre would never compromise.
Cleaving to Catholic doctrine made him wise.

In last month's issue of *The Recusant* (www.The Recusant.com) is a translation into English of Archbishop Lefebvre's last interview, published in French (*Fideliter* #79) shortly before his death in March of 1991. He is always refreshing to read. He is clear, because he thinks from basic Catholic principles. He is transparent, because he has nothing to hide. He is unambiguous, because he is not trying to compromise Our Lord's Church with Satan's Vatican II. But notice how the interviewer's questions indicate that the readership of *Fideliter* was naturally inclining to take the direction which the Society of St Pius X would begin to take a few years after the Archbishop's death. Here is a selection of the questions and answers, somewhat abbreviated:—

Q: Why can you not make one last approach to Rome? We hear the Pope is "ready to receive you." A: That is absolutely impossible, because the principles which now guide the Conciliar church are more and more openly contrary to Catholic doctrine. For instance Cardinal Ratzinger recently said that the Popes' great anti-modernist documents of the 19th and 20th centuries rendered a great service in their day, but are now outdated. And John-Paul II is more ecumenical than ever (1990). "It is absolutely inconceivable that we can agree to work with such a hierarchy."

Q: Has the situation in Rome deteriorated even since the negotiations of 1988?

A: Oh yes! "We will have to wait some time before considering the prospect of making an agreement. For my part I believe that God alone can save the situation, as humanly we see no possibility of Rome straightening things out."

Q: But there are Traditionalists who have made an agreement with Rome while conceding nothing. A: That is false. They have given up their ability to oppose Rome. They must remain silent, given the favours they have been granted. Then they begin to slide ever so slowly, until they end up admitting the errors of Vatican II. "It's a very dangerous situation." Such concessions by Rome are meant only to get Traditionalists

to break with the SSPX and submit to Rome.

Q: You say that such Traditionalists have “betrayed.” Isn’t that a bit harsh?

A: Not at all! For instance Dom Gérard made use of me, of the SSPX and its chapels and benefactors, and now they suddenly abandon us and join with the destroyers of the Faith. They have abandoned the fight for the Faith. They can no longer attack Rome. They have understood nothing of the doctrinal question. It is awful to think of the youngsters who joined them for the sake of Tradition and are now following them to Conciliar Rome.

Q: Is there a danger in remaining friends with Traditionalists who have gone over to Rome, and in attending their Masses?

A: Yes, because at Mass there is not only the Mass but there is also the sermon, the atmosphere, the surroundings, the conversations before and after Mass, and so on. All of these things make you little by little change your ideas. There is a climate of ambiguity. One is in an atmosphere submissive to the Vatican, subject ultimately to the Council, so one ends up by becoming ecumenical.

Q: John-Paul II is very popular. He wants to unite all Christians.

A: But in what unity? No longer in the Faith which a soul must accept, and which calls for conversion. The Church has been distorted, from being a hierarchical society into being a “communion.” Communion in what? Not in the Faith. No wonder one hears that Catholics are leaving the Faith in droves. (to be continued)

Kyrie eleison.

WEBSITE LAUNCH

No. CCCLXXVIII (378)

October 11, 2014

On a new website will, we hope, be found
Some food for thought both Catholic and sound.

On the Feast of Our Lady of the Rosary a website has just been launched on the Internet which could be of serious interest to regular readers of these Eleison Comments. It will be found at www.stmarcelinitiative.com. It will present the latest issue and all back-issues of the Comments in English and Italian back to 2007, and the latest issue and back-issues for the last five years or so in French, German and Spanish. And for readers who prefer reading on paper to reading on an electronic screen, the website will offer various means of choosing back-issues and printing them together.

A second section of the website, “Books and Talks,” will make available recorded conferences and sermons of Bishop Williamson, copies on paper of the first two of the four volumes of his “Rector’s Letters” written in the USA between 1983 and 2003, and all extant literature seminars of Dr. White. Again, modern electronics will provide a variety of ways of reaching and downloading these recordings, but only a few are on video as well as on audio. Orders to purchase can also be made by telephone by dialling +1 844 SMI SHOP, i.e., 1 (844) 764–7467.

Catholics – and non-Catholics! – not yet familiar with the literature recordings of Dr. White should seize this opportunity to see how he uses the classics of world literature as a bridge to connect the Faith to the world around us. The gap between these two grows greater every day. Conciliar Catholics have tried to adapt yesterday’s Faith to today’s world and many have lost their Faith in the process. Traditional Catholics are liable to scorn both today’s world as irredeemably lost, and world literature as irredeemably “unspiritual,” and the Faith of many of them has become quite detached from reality in the process. Dr. White has both a strong faith and a firm grip on the real world around us today, and his mastery of world literature has enabled him to make sense of both for countless souls, old and young, who felt otherwise hopelessly schizophrenic. Strongly recommended.

A third section of the website concerns “Donations.” It will present a similar variety of electronic means of donating to help maintain an oasis of, one hopes, good sense amidst today’s wasteland of nonsense. It should allow benefactors to donate what they want, when they want, on the schedule they want, and with ease. To set up the website has actually been quite an expense on its own. We think it should prove well worth while, but it has been one more reason for us to appeal to your generosity. We thank you in advance.

A fourth section is entitled “Information.” It will tell a little about the St Marcel Initiative, about how the website operates, and about what Bishop Williamson has been doing and hopes to do. However, news of his future engagements must be released with a measure of caution, because he does not have only friends around the world.

The Internet has serious drawbacks and dangers, but there is no question that, by an astonishing variety of electronic means, truths can be found on it that can be found nowhere else. We gently hope that this new website will contribute to that fund of truth. A lot of work has gone into putting it together, and besides the contribution of the many workers, that of many benefactors has also been indispensable. We sincerely thank all concerned. May God repay each of them, each of yourselves.

Kyrie eleison.

INSIDE STORY – I

No. CCCLXXIX (379)

October 18, 2014

If Mary tells us how to save the Church,
All other means will leave us in the lurch.

After 1917 it was made clear to the world by Our Lady of Fatima that the salvation of Church and world (“a period of peace”) depended upon two things: not only upon the Consecration of Russia to her Immaculate Heart by the Pope with all the bishops of the world, but also upon Catholics making reparation to her Heart by receiving Confession and Communion and by meditating for 15 minutes and praying a rosary on each first Saturday of the month. Therefore let no Catholic think that there is nothing they can do to help Church and world out of their present appalling crisis. Every single Catholic responding to her second request will help the Pope to respond to her first request.

But this response has not yet been sufficient. For instance in the 1930’s, Pope Pius XI was well aware of Our Lady’s first request, but he never performed the Consecration of Russia. Why not? According to Brother Michael of the Holy Trinity in the second of his excellent three volumes on *The Whole Truth About Fatima*, it was because Pius XI was engaged at that time in diplomatic contacts with the Russian authorities in Moscow, and he thought that his own diplomacy was a better way of dealing with Communists than Our Lady’s Consecration. He preferred the human to the divine way of dealing with the problem, and so of course the problem remained unsolved. The world plunged into World War II, and the Church was broken from within by Vatican II.

Now in the 2010’s a parallel story has been coming to light of Our Lady appealing through a messenger to Bishop Fellay for the Society of St Pius X to organize a Rosary Crusade to pray for the Consecration of Russia to take place. If this story is true (as I believe it is, and some other priests also believe), it is worth telling in a few issues of these Comments, not to discredit Bishop Fellay (whose preference for human means is as understandable as that of Pius XI – God is their judge), but in order to emphasize how urgent the Consecration of Russia remains, and especially the devout

practice of the five first Saturdays, even nigh on 100 years later. But is the story true? In particular, how reliable is the messenger?

I myself have met with her several times, and I believe her story has every likelihood of being true, firstly because she is a serious adult person who gives every sign of telling the truth, but mainly because what she tells is an inside story that corresponds to, and explains, a large number of public facts and well-known events on the outside, so to speak. As to the messenger, readers are entitled to distrust my personal judgment, but as to the perfect correspondence between inside story and outside facts, readers can judge for themselves.

The story begins on Good Shepherd Sunday of 2004, when the Blessed Virgin Mary appeared to the messenger and gave her a message to be passed on to the Bishop of the Society of St Pius X. In it she asked for the SSPX to lead the faithful in a Rosary Crusade for the Consecration of Russia to her Immaculate Heart, that same Consecration that Heaven has been asking for since the 1920's. The understanding in the 2000's was that if this were done as she asked, it would at last obtain, through her, the graces to bring about the much needed Consecration.

In June of 2006 the messenger gave the message in person to Bishop Fellay. He discussed it with her, but did not yet know that it was in fact a directive from the Mother of God. And so on his way back to Switzerland he took a first important decision. As Americans say, "Stay tuned"!

Kyrie eleison.

INSIDE STORY – II

No. CCCLXXX (380)

October 25, 2014

”The best-laid plans of men gang aft agley”* –
When Heaven speaks, we humans need to obey.

When the idea of a Rosary Crusade for the Consecration of Russia was first put to Bishop Fellay in June of 2006, he did not yet know that the idea was in fact a directive from Our Lady – the messenger had been too shy to tell him. So he did not knowingly go against Heaven’s will when on returning to Switzerland after his meeting with the messenger, he decided to take up the idea of a Crusade, but to apply it primarily to the liberation of the Tridentine Mass, leaving Russia’s Consecration among the secondary intentions. So, as Our Lady told her messenger, while she would bless the first Crusade as a sign that the messages were really from her, it would not be to confirm that the liberation of the Mass was what she really wanted. The true answer to the crisis of Church and world lay in Russia’s Consecration, as would soon be made very clear to the Bishop.

So, given the backing of Our Lady, the first Crusade was an unexpected success, both in the number of rosaries prayed by the people, and in Pope Benedict XVI’s fulfilment of Bishop Fellay’s long-standing wish by the declaration in his *Motu Proprio* of July 2007, that the Tridentine Mass had never been abrogated.

However, already in August of 2006, Our Lady had directed her messenger to send to Bishop Fellay a letter in which he was this time fully informed of all the details of her original request, including that it came from Heaven. To this letter the Bishop had responded positively, saying that he would use the boost from the first Crusade to launch the second, and that it would be best if he himself took the matter in hand. But one year later, soon after the *Motu Proprio* until the end of 2007, Our Lady directed the messenger to write to him, again and again, to remind him of her wish for a second Crusade that would be properly dedicated to the Consecration of Russia.

Still Bishop Fellay hesitated to commit himself, so in early 2008 Our Lady came back even more insistently with the same request for the Crusade to be dedicated to the Consecration. The problem was that Bishop Fellay had long been working on his own

plan to solve the Church crisis by a reconciliation between the Society of St Pius X and Rome, and Our Lady's request did not fit in with that plan. Therefore the more progress he seemed to be making with the Romans towards reconciliation, the more difficult it was becoming for him to keep his promise of doing what she asked, because he knew that what she asked would upset the Romans. Indeed . . .

It was at about this time that the messenger, being unaware of why the Bishop was continuing to stall over Our Lady's request, asked her if the reason was that the Bishop was not sure that the request was indeed coming from Our Lady. "No," came the simple answer, as Our Lady lowered her head and shook it gently from side to side, "that is not why." Our Lady did not say what the real reason was, she only said that it was not because the Bishop did not believe that it was herself making the request.

We approach the climax of the drama. Drama it was. In early 2008 the Blessed Virgin's message concerning the Consecration of Russia was becoming urgent, as she knew that the Bishop was seriously thinking of making use of the second Crusade for his own purposes. This time he wanted to use it to achieve the second of the pre-conditions for discussions with Rome – the lifting of the so-called excommunications of the four SSPX bishops in 1988.

Kyrie eleison.

(*Famous line from a poem by the Scot, Robbie Burns (1759–1796), meaning "go often wrong.")

INSIDE STORY – III

No. CCCLXXXI (381)

November 1, 2014

The modern world and Vatican II are wrong.
And Bishop F.? Mistaken all along.

To continue the story of Our Lady's messages to the Superior General of the Society of St Pius X (SSPX) six years ago, some background is needed. Vatican II (1962–1965) wrenched the Catholic Church off course to reconcile it with the godless modern world. Archbishop Lefebvre (1905–1991) founded the SSPX in 1970 to help Catholics to stay on course, and for 21 years he kept it on course. But as soon as he died, mistakenly convinced (or self-deluded, God knows) that they were still following him, his younger successors in fact dreamt of a reconciliation with Conciliar Rome.

In 2000 the Conciliar leaders sat up and took notice of the SSPX when it made a highly successful Jubilee pilgrimage to the Basilicas of Rome. Public (as opposed to private) contacts were re-opened between the SSPX and the Romans, who now set about swallowing that SSPX which they had proved unable to spit out. "Let us talk," they said. The SSPX leaders appeared to be wary: "You must prove your good will by liberating the Tridentine Mass and lifting the excommunications imposed on the SSPX bishops consecrated on June 30, 1988." Little then happened, at least in public, because on both sides the idea of reconciliation needed to mature, but in 2006 Bishop Fellay, SSPX ringleader of the reconciliation, was re-elected Superior General. As we have seen, this was soon after Our Lady began to intervene with the messages of which we are telling the story.

In 2006 her desire for a Rosary Crusade for Russia's Consecration was adopted by Bishop Fellay, but re-directed by him towards the first pre-condition for talks with Rome, the liberation of the Mass. In 2007 Benedict XVI partially satisfied the pre-condition with his *Motu Proprio*. Rejoicing as though it were a complete satisfaction, Bishop Fellay moved on to the second pre-condition, the lifting of the excommunications, whereas Our Lady, immediately after the *Motu Proprio*, began a series of messages in August of 2007 insistently requesting that any second Rosary Crusade be dedicated to the Consecration of Russia. But Bishop Fellay would not

commit himself because he knew that this Consecration did not appeal to the Romans. They wanted talks, and so did he, to reconcile the irreconcilable, Vatican II and Catholic Tradition. Now we can continue with the story.

In early 2008 Our Lady, observing how the Bishop was still hesitating, told him quite firmly through the messenger that he was “not to use the (second) Crusade for the intention of lifting the excommunications,” and that if he did, “it would be fatal for the Society of St Pius X.” She added that she would not bless any such effort, but would instead use the rosaries prayed by the faithful for other purposes. And on March 22, Holy Saturday, she said most specifically, “Tell Bishop Fellay that he cannot move any closer to Rome than he already is, however well-intentioned the Holy Father may be.” And she repeated, “Remember, however well-intentioned the Holy Father may be.”

Let the story again be interrupted to point out how pertinent this message was for the defence of the Faith, and how perfectly this inside story corresponds to the outside facts. At the head of the last worldwide bastion of the true Faith, Bishop Fellay is being tempted to put it back under the Conciliar Romans, terrible enemies of that Faith. Because he does not understand the modern world, he believes that the Conciliar Church is the Catholic Church and he trusts in the good intentions of its authorities (on the contrary Archbishop Lefebvre, after years of negotiations with the Roman authorities, described them – in private – as “a snake”). So if this inside story is true, and if Bishop Fellay makes the wrong decision, the SSPX is doomed. What happened? (To be continued.)

Kyrie eleison.

INSIDE STORY – IV

No. CCCLXXXII (382)

November 8, 2014

The Bishop's Roman plans were well on track
Till Providence intervened and held them back.

And so we come to the climax of the inside story of the outside events of the Rosary Crusades of the Society of St Pius X six years ago. Would Bishop Fellay choose Heaven's solution to the crisis of Church and World, trusting in Our Lady's promise at Fatima of Russia's conversion and a "period of peace" if only Russia is consecrated to Her Immaculate Heart, or would he choose the human solution of talks with Rome to fabricate a synthesis of Tradition ($2+2=4$) with the Council ($2+2=4$ or 5)? We can be certain that this is not how the Devil presented the choice to the Bishop, especially when in June 2008 the Romans came back into play.

In that month the Vatican became aware of the possible Rosary Crusade for the Consecration of Russia through a letter which the same messenger of Our Lady had addressed to Pope Benedict XVI, invoking his blessing upon such an endeavor. The Vatican took the letter seriously. Cardinal Darío Castrillón Hoyos ordered Bishop Fellay to return directly to Rome from Hawaii where His Excellency had gone to administer the sacrament of Confirmation. On June 4, Cardinal Castrillón with a group of several Roman prelates threatened Bishop Fellay that if he were to call for a Rosary Crusade for the Consecration of Russia, Rome would close the door to any future discussions, and Rome would revive the dormant "excommunications" which had for the time being been rendered inoperative. That was also when the Vatican tried to impose on Bishop Fellay the "Vatican Ultimatum," or five conditions necessary for any discussions.

So under this Roman pressure, Bishop Fellay had still not decided in the early autumn of 2008 to do as Our Lady asked, despite her repeated requests, and in fact on October 5, 2008, despite her direct warnings, he chose to apply the Second Rosary Crusade, set to run from November 1 until Christmas, to the intention of the "excommunications" of 1988 being lifted. On the same day Our Lord displayed His anger to the messenger of Our Lady by a vision of Him bringing down His hand to

destroy the SSPX, while he referred to them as “Pharisees and hypocrites,” and said, “I can no longer put up with them.” But in the very moment of Our Lord’s hand falling, the messenger saw the Blessed Virgin Mary interceding on the Society’s behalf, pleading for mercy and saying “Remember the weakness of men.” The messenger then saw Our Lord’s anger immediately give way to His mercy.

But the Bishop’s mind was now made up. Three weeks later on October 26, at the Pontifical Mass climaxing the Society’s pilgrimage to Lourdes for the 150th Jubilee of Our Lady’s apparitions at Lourdes, he went ahead with announcing that the second Rosary Crusade would be dedicated to the lifting of the “excommunications” of 1988. On December 16 he wrote in private to the Pope, as requested by Benedict XVI, the letter asking the Pope for the lifting of the excommunications of 1988. On January 24, 2009, these were partially lifted by Rome. Bishop Fellay directly attributed this to the intervention of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and he must have exulted in this seeming triumph of his patient diplomacy.

Alas, any triumph was short-lived, because within days the enemies of Catholic Tradition fired off in their worldwide media a torpedo perfectly designed to blow out of the water the threatening reunion of the Catholic Pope with Catholic Tradition. When the six-minute film clip from November 1 of an SSPX Bishop casting serious doubt on the “holocaust” and “gas chambers” of World War II was made public, Benedict XVI had to run for cover from the deadly accusation of consorting with “anti-semites.” The SSPX-Rome agreement was blocked, for at least a few years. (To be concluded.)

Kyrie eleison.

INSIDE STORY – V

No. CCCLXXXIII (383)

November 15, 2014

Three good young men were swept to icy death.
Let's heed Our Lady, to our dying breath.

When Bishop Fellay's long-laid plans to save the Society of St Pius X and the Church by reconciling them through a blending of Tradition with the Council were blown out of the water in January of 2009 by the worldwide publicity given to the totally "politically incorrect" views of a colleague in the SSPX, one might have sympathised with him, were such a blending not an impossible dream. But God's own Catholic religion mixes with its Conciliar imitation, "fruit of the work of human hands," like oil mixes with water, or truth with falsehood. Catholics with memories reaching back to 1988 could remember Archbishop Lefebvre branding any such effort for the SSPX as "Operation Suicide," suicide firstly for the SSPX but also for anything the SSPX might have been able to do for the Universal Church.

Therefore clear-minded Catholics breathed a great sigh of relief when in that month Providence used the Church's enemies with their worldwide media to torpedo the joint efforts of Benedict XVI and Bishop Fellay to blend Council and Tradition. And such Catholics may have had dramatic but discreet confirmation from Providence that they were thinking correctly.

The "lifting" by Benedict XVI of the 1988 "excommunications" of the four SSPX bishops declared by Rome immediately upon their consecration, was directly attributed by Bishop Fellay, in public, to the intervention of Our Lady, thanks to the second SSPX Rosary Crusade at the end of 2008. Yet she had told him through her messenger early in the same year that if the Crusade was not this time dedicated to the Consecration of Russia, she would use the rosaries prayed for some other purpose. If these messages are true, Heaven cannot have taken too kindly to her having been manipulated for Church politics at the SSPX Jubilee celebration in Lourdes of October, 2008.

In any case, when on February 11, 2009, three weeks after the "lifting," seminarians from the SSPX mother-house in Écône, Switzerland, were making a recreational

excursion in the mountains nearby, three of them were caught in an avalanche, swept downhill and drowned in an icy mountain lake. And what is February 11? The Feast-day of Our Lady of Lourdes.

Mere coincidence? Or Heaven speaking through events, by one more correspondence between the inside story of these messages and the outside story of the first two Rosary Crusades? Readers will judge for themselves. If they are convinced that the Newsociety is on the right track when it seeks official approval from the Newchurch, they will have no difficulty in dismissing this series of messages supposedly from Heaven as one more “private revelation,” unworthy of serious consideration. On the other hand if in their judgment both Newsociety and Newchurch are on the wrong track, then it would make sense that, the world being on the brink of unimaginable disaster for having neglected the Consecration of Russia, Our Lady made one more attempt to obtain that Consecration through prayers launched by the SSPX.

Not that the SSPX was ever the salvation of the Church, but that if its prayers had been rightly directed, then as Our Lady gave her messenger to understand, she could have obtained from her Son the graces necessary to obtain that Consecration, and by it she could have saved both SSPX and Church and world. It is of no use now to “cry over spilt milk.” It is of use to practise the devotion of the First Saturdays, for Our Lady’s sake especially. She will not cease trying to save us.

Kyrie eleison.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY

No. CCCLXXXIV (384)

November 22, 2014

A great Archbishop, forty years ago,
Measured the Council's doctrine, and said "No."

Yesterday was the 40 th anniversary of Archbishop Lefebvre's historic Declaration on November 21, 1974, of the reasons for which he and the priests and laity following him were taking their stand against the total change of the Catholic Church and religion being wrought in the wake of the Second Vatican Council. The Declaration is a fresh today as it was on the day when it was written, because the true Catholic religion of God is unchangingly true, while the Conciliar religion of man is resolutely false and it is occupying Rome more than ever.

The Declaration consists of ten brief paragraphs, little more than 50 lines in all: 1/ We cleave to Catholic Rome, eternal Rome. 2/ We refuse Conciliar Rome, neo-Protestant and neo-modernist. 3/ The Conciliar reform is destroying the Catholic Church and diminishing our Catholic Faith, 4/ as not even an angel from Heaven has the right to do (Galatians I, 8). 5/ We choose Tradition, we refuse innovations. 6/ Everything in the Church is being renewed in a way opposite to age-old Catholic doctrine. 7/ The Conciliar reform, coming from heresy and resulting in heresy, is unacceptable to Catholics, so 8/ we shall continue to form Traditional priests. 9/ And we shall cleave to the Catholic teaching and practice of all time, 10/ being convinced that by so doing we will remain truly faithful Catholics.

Notice firstly the clear and sharp distinction (1 and 2) between Catholic Rome and Conciliar Rome. Now it is true to say that Conciliar Rome is occupying the structures of Catholic Rome, but to say that the Conciliar Church is therefore none other than the Catholic Church is as foolish as to say that a cuckoo is a nightingale because it occupies a nightingale's nest. (And to say that the Archbishop wrote of Conciliar and Catholic "Rome" and not of the Conciliar and Catholic "Church" is to quibble with words.)

But how does the Archbishop distinguish between Conciliar cuckoo and Catholic nightingale? By doctrine! Conciliarism is neo- Protestant and neo- modernist (2). Our

faith is being diminished (3), in opposition to Catholic doctrine (6). Conciliarism is heresy (7). We cleave to Catholic teaching (9). And the brief summary above does not give all of the Archbishop's references to doctrine. Catholic doctrine was the Northern star of his mind and action. It is because modern man wants freedom for his mind and action that he in effect wants his mind to be reduced to mush, whereupon doctrine has no more than a merely decorous function. It has no more bite upon man's action, except the one disastrous doctrine that doctrine is unimportant. And that disastrous doctrine has a total bite. Here is why the Archbishop is being reduced within the Society of St Pius X, which he founded, to little more than a decorous mascot.

One is impelled to ask, what is it going to take to restore the bite of doctrine, the sense of reality and the love of truth in Society, Church and world? Surely suffering, no less. Solzhenitsyn made a remark to the effect that it will take the crowbar of events to smash open the concrete casing which modern man has built around his sinful way of life. Truly, Lord have mercy.

Kyrie eleison.

LIVING POPES

No. CCCLXXXV (385)

November 29, 2014

The Church needs living Popes, however bad.
Kill off the Church they won't, however mad.

On January 29, 1949, Pope Pius XII made the following remarks about the importance of the Pope: If ever one day – speaking purely hypothetically – material Rome were to collapse; if ever this Vatican basilica, symbol of the one and only victorious Catholic Church, were to bury beneath its ruins the historic treasures and sacred tombs which it encloses, even then the Church would be in no way demolished or split. Christ's promise to Peter would still hold true, the Papacy would last for ever, like the Church, one and indestructible, being founded on the Pope then living .”

Since these words are classic Church doctrine (only the underlining has been added), resting as they do on Our Lord's own words (Mt. XVI, 16–18), then it is small wonder if, ever since 1962 when the living Popes became Conciliar, millions upon millions of Catholics have been driven to becoming likewise Conciliar and liberal. The only way out of the problem that sedevacantists can see is to deny that the Conciliar Popes have been Popes at all, which can seem to be common sense, but to most Catholics it seems even more to be common sense that the Church designed by God to rest upon the living Pope cannot have existed for the last half century (1962–2014) without one.

It is easy to see how the decline of Christian civilisation since the height of the Middle Ages has led to the present corruption of the living Popes. It is easy to see how God can have permitted this appalling corruption to punish that appalling decline. What is less easy to see is how the Church can still live when the living Popes on whom it is founded are convinced that liberalism, war on God, is Catholic. In Our Lord's own words, A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit and an evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit (Mt. VII, 18).

But a tree half good, half bad, can produce fruits half good, half bad. Now taken as a whole, a mixture of good and bad is bad, but that does not mean that taken part by part, the mixture's good parts are as bad as its bad parts. Cancer in the liver will kill

me, but that does not mean that I have cancer in the lungs. Now no living churchman, any more than any man alive, is entirely good or entirely bad. We are all a fluctuating mixture until the day we die. So can there ever have been a living Pope whose fruits were entirely evil? The answer can only be, no. In which case the Catholic Church can have half-lived for the last 50 years on the half-good fruits of the Conciliar Popes, with a half-life permitted by God to purify his Church, but which he would never permit to go so far as to kill his Church.

Thus for example Paul VI wept for the lack of vocations. Benedict XVI hankered after Tradition. Even Pope Francis surely means to bring men to God when he drags God down to men. So, Conciliar Popes are dreadfully mistaken in their ideas, fatally ambiguous in the Faith where they need to be absolutely unambiguous. The Church has been and is dying beneath them, but whatever parts in them have still been good have enabled the Church to continue, and they have been needed as living heads to continue the body of the living Church, as Pius XII said. Then let us not fear that they will be allowed to kill off the Church, but let us for our part fight their liberalism tooth and nail and pray for their return to Catholic sanity, because we do need them for the life of our Church.

Kyrie eleison.

RESISTANCE ADVICE

No. CCCLXXXVI (386)

December 6, 2014

The “Resistance” may or may not organize,
But suffering will be its hallmark and its prize.

A precious exchange of e-mails came recently over my desk which I am sure many souls in their difficult circumstances of today will appreciate. The problem comes from a typical 21 st century city-dweller who has the Faith but feels abandoned. The solution presented here is based on a prophecy of Our Lady from the 17 th century! Firstly, the problem:—

“I am a female nurse from Germany, 48 years old. 12 years ago I entered a Convent and loved it, trying to deepen my relationship with God, but after 10 years I had to leave because of the modernism. I could not take my final vows because the Community was far from the Truth. I thought that leaving would please my heavenly Father and make me a kind of heroine in his eyes, but now I am very sad, and feel abandoned by God, not at all like a heroine.

“Two years ago I did get a job back in the hospital where I worked before entering the Convent, but here I am back in the world where the people around me are ignorant or modern, where nobody has any faith, and if they do, they don’t know why. I am too old to be able to find a job close to the sacraments. Shift work stops me from getting to Mass every Sunday. The nearest Traditional Mass is an hour’s drive away. So here I am, sitting in the dark, with little access to the sacraments. The situation in Church and world is so confused that I just do not know what to do. Where is there a way out of the darkness? Where do I go to figure out what I am supposed to do with my life? “

And now in answer to the problem, advice which any number of us in the quote-unquote Resistance, seeking to withstand the worldwide apostasy, can take to heart:—

“Dear friend, in Ecuador in 1634 Our Lady gave to a holy nun almost direct guidance for us in these unholy times which we are blessed to live in (even though they may not feel like a blessing). She promised that there would always be, despite the worldwide

apostasy, souls that would remain faithful and would preserve the treasure of the Faith and virtues. But they would suffer a cruel, unspeakable and prolonged martyrdom. She said, ‘ In order to free men from bondage to the heresies all around, the souls chosen by my Most Holy Son to effect the restoration will need great strength of will, constancy, valour and confidence in God. To test this faith and confidence of the just, there will be occasions where all will seem to be lost. Just then will be the happy beginning of the restoration.’

“There is an excellent summary of this message of Our Lady on the Internet at: [OUR LADY OF GOOD SUCCESS: prophetic revelations made to Venerable Mother Mariana de Jesus Torres.](#)

“Many of us find ourselves in similar circumstances to yours. We are deprived of the help and strength which comes from living in a community surrounded by our fellow Catholics with a rule and Superior to guide us. While I am not a religious, it is still a tremendous suffering for me to be deprived of Sacraments, priests and fellow Catholics, and to find myself having to work in the very world which my heart, mind and soul reject. But this is the suffering God is permitting for many of us and the very suffering we must embrace, being in union with His will for each of us, uniting our sufferings to those which our beloved Saviour suffered and offered for us. By so doing we are drawn to Him like His little ones. He has not forgotten you. On the contrary, by all you endure, you give to His Sacred Heart and the Immaculate Heart of Mary much needed consolation and may perhaps be obtaining graces for those who have lost the Faith.”

Kyrie eleison.

DISTINCTIONS NECESSARY

No. CCCLXXXVII (387)

December 13, 2014

The Council works from dangerous greys to black. A Catholic seeks out white to stay on track.

The principle that cancer of the liver will kill me without my necessarily having lung cancer (cf. the EC of Nov. 29) is annoying, because it means that I may need to distinguish instead of indulging myself in blanket condemnations, but distinctions are common sense and correspond to reality. So in today's universal confusion, to stay in touch with reality there are times when I need to recognize that a mixture of good and bad will be bad as a whole, but that does not mean that its good parts, as parts, are bad, any more than that the goodness of the good parts means that the whole is good.

Take for instance the Novus Ordo Mass. The new Rite as a whole so diminishes the expression of essential Catholic truths (the Real Presence, the Sacrifice, the sacrificing priesthood, etc.) that it is as a whole so bad that no priest should use it, nor Catholic attend it. But that does not mean that that part of the Mass which is the sacramental Form of Consecration of the bread and wine is bad or invalid. "This is my Body" is certainly valid, "This is the chalice of my Blood" is most likely to be valid, and it is certainly not invalidated by the new rite as a whole being so uncatholic. Therefore if I say that the new Mass must always be avoided, I am telling the truth, but if I say it is always invalid, I am not telling the truth and sooner or later I will pay the penalty for exaggerating.

Similarly with the new Rite of priestly Ordination. The new Rite as a whole has severely diminished the expression of essential truths of the Catholic priesthood, especially that it is a sacrificing priesthood, but that part of the new Rite which is the sacramental Form is, at any rate in the new Latin version, if anything stronger (by the "et" instead of "ut") than the old Latin version. Therefore assuming that the ordaining bishop is a true bishop and had the true sacramental Intention, it is simply not true to say that no priest ordained in the new Rite can be a true priest. And if one says it, sooner or later one will pay some penalty for departing from the truth.

Now from the de-catholicisation of these two new Rites as wholes, while one may not

argue that their sacramental Forms are invalid, one may well argue that in the end they will undermine and invalidate the priest's or bishop's sacramental Intention, but that is a different argument, no longer in black and white but, alas, in grey. For indeed the argument is that the steady use of de-catholicised Rites will slowly so alter the priest's or bishop's concept of what the Church does with those Rites that in the end he will no longer have the Catholic Intention to do what the Church does, Intention necessary for validity of the sacrament. In other words, white will only gradually turn through grey to black. But who, other than Almighty God, can know for certain when the grey turns into black? Once more, I must take care if I want to discern and know the truth.

This playing between white and black, this ambiguity, is what is properly diabolical in the Conciliar reform of the sacramental Rites. If I wish to tell the truth, I will not yet say that they have destroyed the Catholic sacraments, but they are certainly undermining them, and so if I wish to keep the Catholic Faith, I will certainly as a whole avoid them.

Kyrie eleison.

PSALMIST'S CRY

No. CCCLXXXVIII (388)

December 20, 2014

In olden times God's People cried for help.
How much the more today they need to yelp.

The season of Our Redeemer's coming amongst us is surely a suitable moment to remind ourselves how much we need God. Of course it has always been so. Before Christ, God came into the ever more wicked pagan world specially to the Israelites with the Old Testament to prepare for the coming of his own Son. Here is Psalm 43, all of which applies both to the Israelites and to Catholics, God's people in Old and New Testaments (Revised Standard Version, titles and brackets added):—

A. GOD USED TO PROTECT HIS PEOPLE.

1 We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us, what deeds thou didst perform in their days, in the days of old: 2 thou with thy own hand didst drive out the nations (pagans), but them (our fathers) thou didst plant; thou didst afflict the peoples (pagans), but them (our fathers) thou didst set free; 3 for not by their own sword did they (our fathers) win the land, nor did their own arm give them victory; but thy right hand, and thy arm, and the light of thy countenance; for thou didst delight in them. 4 Thou art my King and my God, who ordainest victories for Jacob. 5 Through thee we push down our foes; through thy name we tread down our assailants. 6 For not in my bow do I trust, nor can my sword save me. 7 But thou hast saved us from our foes, and hast put to confusion those who hate us. 8 In God we have boasted continually, and we will give thanks to thy name for ever.

B NOW HE HAS REJECTED THEM.

9 Yet thou hast cast us (Israelites) off and abased us, and hast not gone out with our armies. 10 Thou hast made us turn back from the foe; and our enemies have gotten spoil. 11 Thou hast made us like sheep for slaughter, and hast scattered us among the nations. 12 Thou hast sold thy people for a trifle, demanding no high price for them. 13 Thou hast made us the taunt of our neighbors, the derision and scorn of those about us. 14 Thou hast made us a byword among the nations, a laughingstock among

the peoples. 15 All day long my disgrace is before me, and shame has covered my face,
16 at the words of the taunters and revilers, at the sight of the enemy and the avenger.

C YET WE HAVE BEEN FAITHFUL.

17 All this has come upon us, though we have not forgotten thee, or been false to thy
(Mosaic) covenant. 18 Our heart has not turned back, nor have our steps departed
from thy way, 19 that thou shouldst have broken us in the place of jackals, and
covered us with deep darkness. 20 If we had forgotten the name of our God, or spread
forth our hands to a strange god, 21 would not God discover this? For he knows the
secrets of the heart.

D O GOD, COME TO OUR HELP!

22 Nay, for thy sake we are slain all the day long, and accounted as sheep for the
slaughter. 23 Rouse thyself! Why sleepest thou, O Lord? Awake! Do not cast us off
for ever! 24 Why dost thou hide thy face? Why dost thou forget our affliction and
oppression? 25 For our soul is bowed down to the dust; our body cleaves to the
ground. 26 Rise up, come to our help! Deliver us for the sake of thy steadfast love!
(end of Psalm 43)

In other words, there was a time when God raised up his Catholic Church to great
heights. But today it is making itself the laughing-stock of the world, to the point that
one can almost be ashamed to be a Catholic. However, there are still faithful
Catholics. O God, come to their help, O God, come to our help!

Kyrie eleison.

ARCHBISHOP'S SENSE – II

No. CCCLXXXIX (389)

December 27, 2014

Towards Rome a great Archbishop, yes, did push.
But what can be done when Romans' minds are mush?

Twelve weeks ago (Oct. 5) "Eleison Comments" presented a first series of extracts from the last public interview of Archbishop Lefebvre, given to Fideliter magazine in early 1991. Here follows a second and last series of extracts, slightly edited but only for the sake of brevity and clarity:—

Q: What conclusions can we draw from the Society of St Pius X after 20 years of its existence?

A: The Good Lord wanted Catholic Tradition. I am deeply convinced that the Society is the means that God wanted to keep and maintain the Faith, the truth of the Church. We must continue faithfully to keep the treasures of the Church, hoping that one day they may resume the place which they should never have lost in Rome.

Q: You often say that, more than the liturgy, it is now the Faith which opposes us to modern Rome.

A: Certainly the question of the liturgy and the sacraments is very important, but the most important is the question of the Faith. This is not a question for us. We have the Faith of all time, of the Council of Trent, of the Catechism of St. Pius X, of all the Councils and all the Popes before Vatican II. For years they have tried in Rome to show that everything in the Council was fully consistent with this Tradition. Now they are showing their true colours by saying there is no longer any Tradition or Deposit to be transmitted. Tradition in the Church is whatever the Pope is saying today. You must submit to what the Pope and the bishops say today. Here is their famous 'Living Tradition,' which was the only basis for our condemnation in 1988.

Now they have given up trying to prove that what they say is consistent with what Pius IX wrote or with what the Council of Trent promulgated. No, all of that is over; it's outdated, as Cardinal Ratzinger said. It is clear, and they might have said so earlier. There was no point in our talking, in our discussing with them. Now we suffer

from the tyranny of authority, because there are no longer any rules from the past.

They are showing more and more that we are right. We are dealing with people who have a different philosophy from ours, a different way of seeing, who are influenced by all modern subjectivist philosophers. For them there is no fixed truth, there is no dogma. Everything is evolving. This is really the Masonic destruction of the Faith. Fortunately, we have Tradition to lean on!

Q: You have emphasized that you are sure that the Society is blessed by God, because at several points it could have disappeared.

A: Indeed. It has kept coming under very difficult attacks. That is very painful, but we must nonetheless believe that the line of Faith and Tradition that we are following, is imperishable, because God cannot allow his Church to perish.

Q: What can you say to those of the faithful who still hope in the possibility of an agreement with Rome?

A: Our true faithful, those who have understood the problem and who have precisely helped us to continue along the straight and firm path of Tradition and the Faith, told me that the approaches I was making towards Rome were dangerous and that I was wasting my time. Yet I hoped until the last minute that in Rome we would witness a little bit of loyalty, so I cannot be blamed for not having done the maximum. So now too, to those who say to me, "You've got to reach an agreement with Rome," I think I can say that I then went even further than I should have.

Kyrie eleison.